

# OTTOMANS LOOKING WEST?

THE ORIGINS OF THE TULIP AGE AND  
ITS DEVELOPMENT IN MODERN TURKEY

CAN ERİMTAN

Library of  
Ottoman Studies  
14

TAURIS ACADEMIC  
STUDIES

OTTOMANS  
LOOKING  
WEST?

*Dedicated to the memory of*  
*Alfredo Pinoli*  
*(1952-2003)*

# OTTOMANS LOOKING WEST?

The Origins of the Tulip Age and  
its Development in Modern Turkey

CAN ERIMTAN

Tauris Academic Studies  
LONDON • NEW YORK

Published in 2008 by Tauris Academic Studies, an imprint of I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd  
6 Salem Road, London W2 4BU  
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010  
www.ibtauris.com

In the United States of America and Canada distributed by  
Palgrave Macmillan, a division of St. Martin's Press  
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010

Copyright © 2008 Can Erimtan

The right of Can Erimtan to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by the author in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988.

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or any part thereof, may not be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Library of Ottoman Studies 14

ISBN: 978 1 84511 491 6

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

A full CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress catalog card: available

Printed and bound in India by Replika Press Pvt. Ltd  
camera-ready copy edited and supplied by the author

# CONTENTS

<i>Note on Transliteration</i>	vi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
Introduction	
The Idea of a ‘Tulip Age’: A Paradigm and Its Meaning	1
I. THE OTTOMAN PERCEPTION OF DAMAD İBRAHİM PAŞA, 1910-20	7
1. The Preamble to the ‘Tulip Age’: The Perception of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim, 1910-12	9
2. The Construction of the ‘Tulip Age’: Ahmed Refik and his <i>Lâle Devri</i> , 1913-15	23
3. Calibrating the Idea of a ‘Tulip Age’: Ahmed Refik’s Publications in the Period 1915-19	59
II. THE KEMALIST PERCEPTION OF DAMAD İBRAHİM PAŞA, 1923-47	85
1. The Establishment of the Turkish Republic and the Quest for a New Historiography, 1923-30	87
2. The Subterranean Survival of the ‘Tulip Age’, 1930-38	115
3. The ‘Tulip Age’ as a Prelude to the <i>Tanzimat</i> : The Re-Appreciation of the Ottomans and Islam, 1940-47	141
Epilogue	
The Politics of History, 1908-50	169
<i>Bibliography</i>	177
<i>Notes</i>	201
<i>Index</i>	257

# NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

I have adhered to Turkish spelling in case of Ottoman and Turkish words.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is nothing if not the outcome of a struggle. When I started looking into the reign of Ahmed III and the idea of a 'Tulip Age', many many years ago, it always bothered me to encounter continuously phrases that proclaim the 'Westernised' character of the era and its protagonists. To my mind, the *Surnâme-i Vehbi* and its attractive pictures stand out as the most maligned and misunderstood illustrated book in Ottoman history. My book addresses some of the reasons why such misapprehensions persist. As a result, I owe a great debt to the many who have believed in me and my project. My mother should take pride of place, closely followed by my paternal grand-uncle, Yüksel Erimtan. In guiding me through the narrow straits of error and inaccuracy, the important roles played by Dr Julian Raby and Dr Celia Kerslake cannot be underestimated. I also need to stress that the hospitality afforded to me by the Beyazid Devlet Kütüphanesi and that august institution's true head and pillar Süheyla Şentürk were invaluable and truly outstanding. There are many more who have helped and supported me throughout the years, I hope they know that my gratitude is heartfelt and eternal. I cannot but express my deepest gratitude to my sweetie Tanya and our son Cihan for being there and ensuring my survival. And, finally, I cannot but express my debt to my friend Wilfried Op 't Eynde whose actions ensured that this book would see the light of day.





# Introduction

## The Idea of a ‘Tulip Age’: A Paradigm and Its Meaning

... in Ottoman studies, we are very willing to forget that everybody ... has an axe to grind, and we are equally reluctant to investigate what kind of an axe that might be ...

Suraiya Faruqi (1991) \*

This book scrutinises the idea of a ‘Tulip Age’ as a time distinct from other periods in Ottoman history. Thus, I will investigate the Turkish literature of the Second Constitutional era (1908-18) and the Republican period of one-party rule (1923-50), which likely provided the source material at the base of the concept of the ‘Tulip Age’. As the renowned Ottomanist Cemal Kafadar points out, one cannot but recognise that certain ideas and notions have been too readily ‘re-circulated without scrutiny’ in many scholarly narratives dealing with Ottoman history. <sup>1</sup> Kafadar critically assesses the idea of a ‘Süleymanic Golden Age’, only to conclude that ‘the whole notion of a “golden age” seems alien to the Ottoman intellectual tradition’, insinuating that this perception of Ottoman history is a kind of historiographical construction. <sup>2</sup> He likewise mentions a ‘catchy depiction’ of the 1718-30 era and in talking about this supposed ‘Tulip Period’, Kafadar asks whether we are ‘justified in using [the term] un-self-consciously as we are doing.’ <sup>3</sup>

As Kafadar indicates, the existence of a ‘Tulip Age’, which phrase he attributes to the ‘historical imaginations’ of Yahya Kemal Beyatlı and Ahmed Refik Altınay, ‘two late Ottoman/early republican authors’, <sup>4</sup> is widely recognised and even universally acknowledged. The latter decades of the twentieth century saw countless studies and events which declared the ‘Tulip Age’ to have been the point of origin of trends close to the heart of many citizens of the Republic of Turkey: modernisation and Westernisation. In particular historians and students of Ottoman art and culture appear to regard the Grand Vezirate or *sadâret* of Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim Paşa as the denotatum of the signifier ‘Tulip Age’. Such a way of looking at Ottoman history has even entered the general Turkish perception of the development of ‘Ottoman-Turkish’ history. The idea of a growing interaction with the West during the early eighteenth century is of such a persuasive nature that, for example, the financial institution Akbank did not hes-

itate to link the term ‘Tulip Age’ with its series of concerts and events celebrating Johann Sebastian Bach in 1998.<sup>5</sup> In a rather ingenious manner, Akbank’s cultural events’ manager insinuated the long-standing connections between Turkish culture and European music in a week-long series of orchestral concerts of Bach’s works, even calling the whole event *Bach, caz ve LALE DEVRI* [‘Bach, Jazz and the Tulip Age’]. The events also included a panel discussion on the ‘Ottomans facing West’ during the first half of the eighteenth century.<sup>6</sup> The Turkish government does not shy away from propagating the idea of a ‘Tulip Age’ abroad either. In February 2001 the Turkish Embassy in London organised an event that saw the academic Talat Halman and the stage actress Yıldız Kenter present a lecture in Oxford, introducing Turkish culture and history to a wider audience.<sup>7</sup> The scope of the event was very wide, but the two speakers easily managed to include a detailed appraisal of the ‘Tulip Age’ as the beginning of modern attitudes in Turkey.

The idea that the reign of Ahmed III witnessed a break with Ottoman tradition also seems to have taken root in the West, as illustrated by the case of the prestigious *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Harold Bowen, in his entry on ‘Ahmad III’ (1960), claims that ‘the twelve years ensuing on the peace of Passarovitz [1718–30] witnessed a remarkable change of taste in poetry, music and architecture and a new inclination to profit by European example.’<sup>8</sup> Approximately twenty-five years later, Irène Melikoff, in her entry on the ‘Lâle Devri’ in the *Encyclopaedia*, calls the policies of Sultan Ahmed and Damad İbrahim ‘a serious movement towards a secular society.’<sup>9</sup> Melikoff’s statement appears to be totally anachronistic, in view of the general historical recognition that the idea of a ‘secular society’ emerged only at the very end of the eighteenth century as a result of the impact of the French Revolution and Napoléon’s subsequent promulgation of the *Code Civil*.<sup>10</sup>

One therefore cannot but conclude that the ‘Tulip Age’, at face value a superficial and even frivolous notion, has been turned into a paradigm determining the way in which a certain phase in Ottoman history is conceptualised. In spite of the fact that the eighteenth century has recently received a great deal of critical attention from a number of different scholars within different disciplines, such as Müge Göcek, Kemal Silay, Tülay Artan, and Virginia Aksan, the paradigm of the ‘Tulip Age’ remains unchallenged. Selahattin Hilav, writing in the critically well-received book series *Türkiye Tarihi* even posits that the ideology of Westernism (*Batıcılık*) predates Islamism (*İslamcılık*) in a Turkish context, pointing to the reign of Ahmed III as its initial moment in Ottoman history.<sup>11</sup>

One could lay the responsibility for the deep-seated nature of the ‘Tulip Age’ paradigm in Turkish historical consciousness on Tarık Zafer Tunaya’s endorsement of the idea of a Westernist ‘Tulip Age’. Tunaya was a renowned and well-respected historian of the various political and ideological movements in

Turkey. His influential *Türkiyenin Siyasî Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri* (1960) opens by positing the date 1718 as the beginning of Westernist tendencies in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>12</sup> He views the period between 1718 and 1826 as the era of hesitant and partial transformations following a Western role-model. Moreover, Tarık Zafer Tunaya assigns the ‘Tulip Age’ the status of a reform movement, on the same level as the military programmes of Selim III called the *Nizam-ı Cedid* or ‘New Order’.<sup>13</sup>

On an international level, Bernard Lewis and Niyazi Berkes established the ‘Tulip Age’ as an important turning point in Turkish history. In the first instance, the seminal *Emergence of Modern Turkey* (1961) fulfilled an important role in popularising the idea that Damad İbrahim Paşa had been a reformer with Westernist tendencies. Lewis, however, does not employ the phrase ‘Tulip Age’ in talking about him.<sup>14</sup> Niyazi Berkes, in his equally influential *Development of Secularism in Turkey* (1964), on the other hand, is firm in defining the qualities of the reforms undertaken. Berkes declares that ‘[a] secular trend . . . was the dominant feature of the Tulip Era’.<sup>15</sup> In the first half of the 1960s these two authorities established the boundaries of the common understanding of the paradigm of the ‘Tulip Age’. Ahmet Evin’s article ‘The Tulip Age and Definitions of “Westernization”’, published in 1980, encapsulates the various strands of the paradigm.<sup>16</sup> On a superficial level, the phrase focuses on the large-scale cultivation and enjoyment of tulips during İbrahim Paşa’s *sadâret*, and the Ottoman élite’s indulgence in pleasure and enjoyment (*zevk ü sefa*).<sup>17</sup> This recognition of the presence of a pleasure-minded attitude in early eighteenth-century İstanbul leads champions of the ‘Tulip Age’ to postulate that contemporary European modes of architecture and garden layout were introduced as a backdrop for the then popular stress on entertainment. Evin, for instance, states that ‘[a]long with French architecture, the [F]rench garden also appeared in ‘Turkey’ during Damad İbrahim’s *sadâret*’.<sup>18</sup>

The champions of the ‘Tulip Age’ also indicate an attempt at structured Westernisation during the ‘Tulip Age’. Evin, for example, talks about an ‘interest in secular learning’ as being prevalent at the time.<sup>19</sup> In particular, the consensus seems to be that during the ‘Tulip Age’ the idea of progress in the form of European technology (‘Policies of progress, construction and innovation’),<sup>20</sup> was imported into the Ottoman sphere. That in fact, ‘[t]he founding of the Mütferrika Press was the singular accomplishment of the Tulip Age’.<sup>21</sup> Ahmet Evin appears to typify a trend of claiming the simultaneous appearance of a pleasure-minded attitude in tandem with the introduction of progress. Evin says that the protagonists of the ‘Tulip Age’ (‘Damat İbrahim Paşa and his circle of friends’) assumed two ‘conflicting roles’ at the time: ‘as serious and committed leaders and as sybaritic dissipators’.<sup>22</sup> The paradigm’s various layers of meaning allow that in the eyes of the champions of the ‘Tulip Age’, for a brief period in the early eigh-

teenth-century (1718-30), Ottomans had started to behave according to European models. In 1987 Müge Göcek summarises the paradigm of the ‘Tulip Age’ as follows:

[During the ‘Tulip Age’] [a] new type of Ottoman emerged, oriented toward the West and assimilating Western culture. . . .

The conservative-progressive tension that gradually eroded the Empire at the very end was established.<sup>23</sup>

The implications of the phrase ‘Tulip Age’ have continued to be accepted *a priori*. Martin Strohmeier, writing in the 1980s in his critical appraisal of Turkish historiography on the Seljuks, for instance, is also unable to resist the idea of a ‘Tulip Age’, stating that prior to Damad İbrahim’s *sadâret* (‘die Tulpenzeit’), the Empire’s population had been isolated from ‘developments’ beyond the Ottoman borders. He then maintains that during the ‘Tulip Age’ a certain privileged section of Ottoman society had become subject to outside influences, leading to a ‘Europeanisation of their life-styles’.<sup>24</sup>

In the early 1990s Suraiya Faroqhi mentions the ‘Tulip Period’ as ‘the first period in Ottoman history in which large sections of the upper class became interested in cultural contact with Europe’.<sup>25</sup> At the close of the twentieth century the Turkish edition of Christoph Neumann’s reinterpretation of the *Tarih-i Cevdet* contains a value-laden phrase about the ‘reforms’ initiated by Damad İbrahim Paşa during the ‘Tulip Age’.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, in the year 2000 Ariel Salzman released an article purporting to outline the beginnings of consumerist attitudes in the Ottoman Empire, using the phrase ‘The Age of Tulips’ in its title.<sup>27</sup> Salzman concentrates on Damad İbrahim’s *sadâret*, mentioning the building of ‘a new palace’, Saadabad, ‘constructed on French plans’. She goes as far as claiming that scholars view the narrative of the latter part of Ahmed III’s reign ‘as a cautionary tale of the perils of precocious modernization’.<sup>28</sup> And in 2003, Akşin Somel published a *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire*, which contains an interesting entry on the ‘Tulip Period’.<sup>29</sup> Somel stresses ‘the pursuit of pleasure’ during Damad İbrahim’s *sadâret*, but also talks of a ‘policy of peace toward the empire’s western neighbors’. In the end, he seems unable to resist the notion that ‘incidental Westernization’ took place in the early eighteenth century,<sup>30</sup> mentioning ‘[p]ark designs from France’, the appearance of the ‘baroque style’ in ‘civil architecture’, and concluding with pointing at the ‘first Ottoman Muslim printing press’ during İbrahim Paşa’s administration.<sup>31</sup> Very recently, Cemal Kafadar has also revisited the issue of the ‘Tulip Age’ in a piece published in the catalogue of the exhibition *The Sultan’s Procession*, held in Istanbul between 1 June and 1 October 2006.<sup>32</sup> Kafadar mentions ‘the so-called Tulip Period (1718-30) . . . [which is] considered to have initiated the lifting of some kind

of presumed iron curtain between an essentialized “Ottoman culture” and a post-Renaissance “European mind”.<sup>33</sup> Even at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Turkey’s perception of its relationship with modernisation and Westernisation is still able to determine the historical imagination.

Here I will analyse and evaluate key texts in Turkish that stand at the basis of the above-mentioned views. I start with the late-Ottoman perception of the latter part of the reign of Ahmed III, and finish with the Kemalist perception of the nature of Damad İbrahim Paşa’s policies. Rather than rework the historicity of the various claims made by the authors under investigation, their methodological approach will be analysed and thus their productions will be subjected to source criticism. The book’s aim is therefore to engage with the idea that, as hinted at by Kafadar, the notion of a ‘Tulip Age’ is a historiographical construct and to dismantle this construction into its separate components. *Ottomans Looking West?* thus tries to determine whether history is the product of its writing rather than a reflection of historical reality as it occurred.<sup>34</sup>

The constructed narrative of the ‘Tulip Age’ presents a picture of a certain section of the Ottoman upper classes in the early eighteenth century which turned away from the certainties of the Islamic Orient, and instead became inclined to follow the innovative ways of the West. In a more general sense, this narrative could in fact be seen as a template for Turkish society as a whole re-orienting itself to the Occident throughout the twentieth century and beyond.



**Part I**

**THE OTTOMAN PERCEPTION  
OF DAMAD İBRAHİM PAŞA,  
1910-20**





## Chapter I/I

# The Preamble to the ‘Tulip Age’: The Perception of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim, 1910-12

Let’s laugh, let’s play, let’s enjoy the world  
let’s drink the nectar of paradise  
from the new fountain  
Let’s watch the water of life gushing  
out of the dragon’s mouth  
Come, my flowing cypress, let’s go to Saadabad  
Nedim (1681-1730)\*

### Naming the ‘Tulip Age’

According to a tradition attributed to the poet Yahya Kemal [Beyatlı]<sup>1</sup> by Nihad Sâmi Banarlı, the historian Ahmed Refik [Altınay],<sup>2</sup> in the capacity of a military engineering officer, visited the French capital at an unspecified date. Nihad Sâmi Banarlı’s conversations with the poet Yahya Kemal were posthumously published in the periodical of the Yahya Kemal Ensitüsü, established to commemorate the great poet.<sup>3</sup> One of these vignettes specifically deals with a supposed meeting of Ahmed Refik and Yahya Kemal in Paris, carrying the significant heading ‘*LÂLE DEVRİ*. Dile ve Tarihe Getirdiği Yeni Tâbirler’ (‘The Tulip Age. [Yahya Kemal’s] New Expressions in Language and History’).<sup>4</sup>

Based on Banarlı, the literary scholar Âlim Kahraman erroneously refers to Ahmed Refik as a member of a committee sent to Paris on a fact-finding mission in 1909, when the *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni* (TOE or Ottoman Historical Society) was founded.<sup>5</sup> Ahmed Refik himself recalls his trip to Paris in a piece he wrote on the French historian Ernest Lavisse, which first appeared in the daily *İkdam* on 16 November 1928.<sup>6</sup> The reference is rather cursory, as its purpose is primarily to stress that the Turkish historian had been fortunate enough to meet his famous French colleague: ‘When I went to Paris in 1910, I had the honour to respectfully pay the great historian [Ernest Lavisse] a

visit.<sup>7</sup> The event seems to have taken place in April 1910, and, according to the article, the two historians engaged in a conversation on the merits of archival records, with Ahmed Refik stressing the large size of the Ottoman archives. Lavissee's note, published by Ahmed Refik, indicates that he had visited him in the capacity of 'captain', corresponding to the Ottoman's rank of Piyâde Yüzbaşı.<sup>8</sup> In an interview conducted on 21 May 1936 for *Peşembe Dergisi*, Ahmed Refik reveals that Lavissee introduced him to the equally eminent Charles Seignobos, whose *Histoire de la civilisation* he greatly admired.<sup>9</sup> In the course of the interview Ahmed Refik furthermore notes that he met Yahya Kemal as well as the painter Sami [Yetik] during his stay in the French capital, which he visited to carry out 'scientific research'.<sup>10</sup> Kahraman correctly places this research trip in the context of the Ottoman government's promotion of the study of history as an intellectual forum. But, Ahmed Refik was sent as a single delegate to investigate France's historiographical tradition in 1910.

### **The *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni* and Ahmed Refik**

Sultan Mehmed V [Reşad] (1909-18) himself acted as the main catalyst in the government's effort to encourage Ottoman history writing. His personal intervention led the Grand Vezir Hüseyin Hilmi Paşa to set up the *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni* (*TOE*) on 27 November 1909 as an academic institution for the study and research of the Ottoman past.<sup>11</sup> The erstwhile minister for education (*Maarif Nâzırı*) Abdurrahman Şeref, appointed *vakaniüvis* (official court chronicler) on 18 May 1909, became the *TOE*'s first president. The Sultan's aim in setting up the organisation was to realise the composition and publication of a grand Ottoman history in the Turkish language, a work generally thought to be so far lacking in the Ottoman world of letters. The first issue of the *TOE*'s periodical (the *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuası* or *TOEM*) announces this goal summarily in the organisation's policy statement ('İfâde-i Merâm').<sup>12</sup> Arguably, this Ottoman history was to be used in Ottoman classrooms to instil a sense of national pride in Ottoman pupils, comparable to the effect the textbook *Histoire de France: cours élémentaire* (better known as *Le Petit Lavissee*) had in the French classrooms of the Third Republic (1870-1914).<sup>13</sup> The *TOE* was thus also instrumental in the government popularising the political precept of Ottomanism, the Empire's official ideological position in the early twentieth century.<sup>14</sup> The above-quoted 'İfâde-i Merâm' leaves no doubt about the fact that the *TOE* adhered strictly to an overtly Ottomanist agenda, stating that the proclamation of a constitutional regime had led to the necessity of teaching a national history to the various ethnic groups living in the Ottoman fatherland,<sup>15</sup> which was commonly referred to as 'Turkey'.<sup>16</sup>

As well as being attached to the Ottoman armed forces,<sup>17</sup> Ahmed Refik was

among the initial members of the *TOE*. He turned out to be one of the most prolific contributors to the *TOEM* as well.<sup>18</sup> According to Hasan Akbayrak, the works of Ahmed Refik take up 16% of the total number of the journal's pages.<sup>19</sup> The Ottoman government and the *TOE* sent him to Paris with a view to acquiring insights into the latest developments in European historical research and its relationship with history education, as is testified by his visit to the French historian Ernest Lavisse. According to Pierre Nora, Lavisse occupied 'an unrivalled place' in the 'formation of national feeling in France between 1870 and 1914' through the effect of his *Histoire de France: cours élémentaire*.<sup>20</sup> It seems that Ahmed Refik's meeting with Lavisse was more than just a fortuitous outcome of his trip to Paris, as the historian himself seems to insinuate.

### Yahya Kemal in Paris, Ahmed Râsim in İstanbul

When Ahmed Refik went to Paris, the poet Yahya Kemal had already been residing there since 1903. Banarlı's vignette mentions how Yahya Kemal's personal rediscovery of Ottoman history and literature in Paris, apparently spurred by the works of the French historian Jules Michelet,<sup>21</sup> led him to reconsider Ottoman poetry, in particular, the works of Ahmed III's court poet Nedim. According to Banarlı, Yahya Kemal had then conceived the idea of designating the latter part of Ahmed III's reign a "Tulip Age":

The expression tulip entertainments existed in old Turkish. But neither those who lived at that period nor those who came after them, neither those who remembered the Saadabad festivities of the time nor those writing about them had thought the expression 'Tulip Age' would encapsulate that entire world [of festivities] [in a concise fashion].<sup>22</sup>

Yahya Kemal's mention of the phrase 'tulip entertainments' in 'old Turkish' seems puzzling. In fact, he seems to be referring here to the work of the journalist and writer Ahmed Râsim who had written an engaging four-volume *Osmanlı Tarihi*, stretching from the reign of Osman Gazi (c.1281-1324) to the deposition of Abdülaziz in 1876.<sup>23</sup> In its second volume, Ahmed Râsim states that '[the era of] (Tulip Entertainments) was a period brought about by Damad İbrahim Paşa, elucidating in the following way:

[The eighteenth-century Ottoman vezir had spent the imperial coffers on] the beautification of the excursion spots on [the river] Kâğıdhane and on the Bosphorus, for the devising of an imperial [circumcision] feast and for the building of kiosks and mansions for himself and his coterie bearing such names as (Nev-Bünyâd), (Mirâbad), (Bağ-ı Ferah) as well as other

like names, in the winter he [organised] helva evenings, and in spring tulip illuminations - this was an entertainment consisting of placing candles in the [midst of] tulip fields, even on the back of turtles candles were placed that gave rise to an agreeable view while walking around at night.<sup>24</sup>

Ahmed Râsim lifted these details from Mustafa Nuri's book *Netâ'ic ül-Vukûât* (1294/1877).<sup>25</sup>

Mansurizâde Mustafa Nuri Paşa had written this important work while serving as *Defter-i Hakanî Nâzırı* (Minister of the Registry of Landed Property) (1876-81). In the first half of the twentieth century Franz Babinger's *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* interprets Nuri's history as a complete departure from the Ottoman norm, calling it the first work to exhibit a 'new' and 'critical' approach to Ottoman history.<sup>26</sup> This view is shared by Neşet Çağatay, who edited the text in the late 1970s. Çağatay claims that Mustafa Nuri had written his history according to a methodology that was to be popularised by Henri Pirenne<sup>27</sup> during the 1920s. Çağatay argues that Nuri attempted to describe the causal links between events rather than simply provide a chronological survey of facts and dates.<sup>28</sup> In his text, Mustafa Nuri is highly critical of Damad İbrahim Paşa, accusing him of a lack of military zeal, mismanagement, avarice, nepotism and an unhealthy appetite for pursuing hedonistic pastimes — pastimes which involved tulips. Ahmed Râsim remains close to Nuri's moral outrage, at times nearly quoting him *verbatim*, albeit in a less flowery version. Mustafa Nuri, in turn, had probably largely based his moral condemnation of Damad İbrahim as a tulip-crazed hedonist on the important work of Ahmed Cevdet.

The monumental twelve-volume *Tarih-i Cevdet* had been commissioned by the *Encümen-i Daniş* (Consultative Council), an Ottoman organisation modelled on the *Académie française* and set up in 1267/1851.<sup>29</sup> This institution had commissioned the then *müderriş* (teacher in a *medrese* or religious college) Ahmed Cevdet Efendi to compose a history of recent events in the Ottoman Empire in a plain and easily comprehensible style.<sup>30</sup> The *âlim* (religious scholar) Ahmed Cevdet had been in the 'retinue of Mustafa Reşid Paşa', the foremost propagator of the *Tanzimat*, since 1846.<sup>31</sup> Cevdet Efendi was to commence his exposition with the conclusion of the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca in 1188/1774.<sup>32</sup> The text subsequently produced by Ahmed Cevdet received the title *Vekâyi-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmaniyye*, or simply *Tarih-i Cevdet*, betraying its proximity to earlier published histories composed by *vakanüvis* or chroniclers. Ahmed Cevdet spent thirty years composing the twelve volumes of his massive *Tarih*.<sup>33</sup> In the first volume, published 1270/1854, Cevdet deals with the development of Ottoman history prior to the conclusion of the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca in twelve separate entries ('makâle').<sup>34</sup> The seventh and eighth

sections partly deal with Damad İbrahim Paşa.<sup>35</sup> Cevdet indicates that Damad İbrahim was responsible for the signature of the Treaty of Passarowitz (21 July 1718). Cevdet declares that Damad İbrahim urged for a peace to enable the armies to regain their former order and discipline. The restored armies would then be in a position to exact a certain measure of revenge from the Habsburgs.<sup>36</sup> Ahmed Cevdet is aware of the negative nature of the settlement. He indicates, however, that Damad İbrahim's earlier promises would have justified the acceptance of these disadvantageous terms. Cevdet's subsequent appraisal of Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* is rather bleak:

Whereas in fact [Damad İbrahim] had been occupying the position of the *sadâret* for more that twelve years in a state of complete independence, and far from disciplining the soldiers he caused the traditional order of the state to become upset. He did not think about anything but [wasteful] expenditure and enjoyment, and in his opinion the terms soldier and battle became terms of abuse. In short, he fell into an extraordinary observance of the ceremonial which is part of the detailed accoutrements of [public] improvements and civilisation, so that he did not [even] think about the military reforms which would safeguard this important business and the civil administration necessary for its upkeep.<sup>37</sup>

The Grand Vezir demobilized the Ottoman armies. Subsequently, Damad İbrahim Paşa and his circle indulged in a pleasure-oriented attitude, even partaking of the consumption of alcohol. In Ahmed Cevdet's view such an attitude led to a complete breakdown of Ottoman society:

And while peace had been concluded so that the soldiery could be put in order and then revenge exacted from the enemy, [Damad İbrahim] became preoccupied with new-fangled ceremonies and games. Even the [common] people became predisposed towards the curse of hedonism and the enjoyment of [the world's] delights so that everybody became engulfed in varieties of enjoyment and amusements. And far from the soldiery's discipline being restored, the old rules and customs which were respected by the people, and even the natural ties between husband and wife were broken.<sup>38</sup>

Ahmed Cevdet supports a traditional Ottoman approach to international relations. He places the Ottomans in constant opposition to their rivals, and claims military conflict to have constituted the only possible way for the Ottomans to interact with their opponents. In contrast, Damad İbrahim used the peace settlement as a pretext to start indulging in all kinds of pleasurable entertainments:

And [borders of] garden plots delicately wrought from a [wide] variety of marbles were laid out and were adorned with a variety of tulips, and at night they were decked out with lamps and illumination [feasts] were organised [by means of] candles lit on the backs of tortoises set free in the tulip gardens.<sup>39</sup>

Mustafa Nuri had clearly read this passage in the *Tarih-i Cevdet*. These apparently endless entertainments lead Cevdet to condemn İbrahim Paşa on moral grounds. In connection with the Damad's moral transgressions, Cevdet also deals extensively with the tulip fashion which pervaded İstanbul at the time, mentioning the sudden rise in their cultivation and the inflated prices people became willing to pay for some of these flowers, such as for example the species named *mabbûb*.<sup>40</sup> In order to curb this excess, Cevdet indicates that the government was forced to impose a price control.<sup>41</sup> The 'tulip hype' in İstanbul during the 1720s leads Ahmed Cevdet to conclude that Damad İbrahim's proclivities as a sybarite had led to a disintegration of the state's affairs, while also giving rise to a spirit of idleness in the Ottoman capital. In this context, Cevdet also refers to the *kasır* (summer palace) of Saadabad, so prominently evoked by Yahya Kemal:

And the [area of] Kâğıdhane was divided amongst high dignitaries and the well-to-do so that approximately sixty kasırs and gardens were laid out and thus [the area] up to Kırk Ağaç became cultivated and the kasır of Saadabad was built. Cascades were organised, and through illuminations [Saadabad] was made a paragon of beauty. And though it was necessary for the Sultan to possess such a joyful spot to show ambassadors and foreigners [alike] in view [of the fact] that it was befitting the honour and pomp of the Sublime State; nevertheless, the games and entertainments at Kâğıdhane also digressed the rules of propriety.<sup>42</sup>

Mustafa Nuri and Ahmed Cevdet, as two well-respected nineteenth-century Ottoman authorities, thus seem to have provided Ahmed Râsim with ample information to proclaim Damad İbrahim's tenure at the head of the Ottoman state an era of 'Tulip Entertainments'. Contrary to Yahya Kemal's apparent approval of the 'Tulip Age', Ahmed Râsim and his predecessors had been scathing about the era of Damad İbrahim and its ill-effects on a moral plane.

Yahya Kemal states that the phrase 'tulip entertainments' had been well-known at the time, but that his own coinage, 'Tulip Age' fully encapsulates the era and its atmosphere. The poet completely side-stepped any form of criticism or condemnation. Instead, he even incorporated the phrase into his own poetic creations. The writer and scholar Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar mentions that the

pieces 'Mahur'dan Gazel', 'Bir Sâki' and 'Sene 1140', which all contain the phrase 'Lâle Devri' ('the Tulip Age'), had been conceived during the poet's sojourn in Paris.<sup>43</sup> In addition, the undated poems 'Mükerrer Gazel' and 'Şerefabad' also contain explicit references to a 'Tulip Age'.<sup>44</sup>

These poetic works (*gazel*) appear to have been written in emulation of the style of the eighteenth-century poet Nedim.<sup>45</sup> But in spite of the fact that an Ottoman poet provided the inspiration for these works, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar suggests that the actual impetus for writing them had come from Paul Verlaine's collection of poems entitled *Fêtes galantes* (1869).<sup>46</sup> According to the literary specialist Susan Taylor-Horrex, the twenty-two poems in *Fêtes galantes* deal with the themes of 'love and passivity'.<sup>47</sup> The work's title is however derived from a term launched by the 'illustrious' art historian Charles Blanc to describe a certain genre of painting produced in the first half of the eighteenth century by Antoine Watteau and his followers.<sup>48</sup> Watteau's 'Embarquement pour Cythère' (1712) typifies the genre, which displays 'an idealised country scene peopled by aristocratic figures'.<sup>49</sup> The men and women in the painting are engaged in merry-making while progressing towards a boat that will take them to the island of Cythera, sanctuary of Aphrodite, the goddess of love.<sup>50</sup> These representations of early eighteenth-century characters indulging in the pleasurable pursuits of love and merriment provide a thematic focus for Verlaine's poems. Watteau's paintings had undergone a revival in mid-nineteenth-century Paris, as illustrated by the enthusiastic writings of Jules and Edmond de Goncourt. These writers actively propagated a renewed interest in eighteenth-century aesthetics during the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>51</sup> The Goncourts call the painter Watteau '[l]e grand poète du XVIIIe siècle' and indicate that his pictures represent joyful yet melancholy scenes.<sup>52</sup> It appears that Yahya Kemal's admiration for Verlaine's poems, in turn, directed him towards the early eighteenth century and to Nedim. Just as Verlaine referred to the early eighteenth century by employing the name 'Fêtes gallantes', Yahya Kemal was also compelled to investigate the early 1700s.<sup>53</sup>

### Yahya Kemal, Nedim and Iran

Rather than Paris, Yahya Kemal re-appreciated early eighteenth-century İstanbul. Under the influence of nineteenth-century French poets and an eighteenth-century aesthetic fashionable at the time, Yahya Kemal attempted to discover joyful yet melancholy occurrences in Ottoman contexts. The poetry of Nedim stands out as typifying early eighteenth-century İstanbul. In general this eighteenth-century poet is seen as one of the great masters of *Divan* literature in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>54</sup> Nedim incorporated the language of early eighteenth-century İstanbul into the poetic imagery of his works, depicting



Saadabad and its residents.<sup>55</sup> Specialists such as Hasibe Mazioğlu consider him to have been an extraordinary innovator. Mazioğlu even suggests that Nedim introduced real emotion into the formalised language of Ottoman poetry.<sup>56</sup> Nedim's influence on subsequent Ottoman poets was extensive as well.<sup>57</sup>

In admiration of Nedim, Yahya Kemal wrote a number of poems imitating the language as well as the imagery of pleasure employed by the eighteenth-century poet. According to Tanpınar, Yahya Kemal painted the life-style of the 'Tulip Age' in an anachronistic fashion, endowing it with a carefree attitude, which was probably more appropriate to Yahya Kemal's own Paris surroundings.<sup>58</sup> In particular, Tanpınar suggests that Yahya Kemal had been thinking of the pictorial representations of the eighteenth-century Venetian carnival while conceiving the above-mentioned works.<sup>59</sup> The images Yahya Kemal describes are scenes of determined enjoyment in the face of an impending end as, for example, in the opening lines of *Bir Sâki* ('A Cupbearer'):

I became acquainted with that apprentice cupbearer in the Tulip Age  
That last age of the cup for those who were smitten <sup>60</sup>

The language of drink and merriment is balanced by words of resignation: cup-bearers serve drinkers that have succumbed to their addiction. Yahya Kemal also leaves no doubt about his idea of the cultural idiom in vogue in the 1720s:

His language was a sample of the accent of Shiraz  
In this age of imale <sup>61</sup> when the land of Rum had been engulfed  
in a craze for all things Persian <sup>62</sup>

The protagonists of these poems speak in an affected voice, full of Persianate expressions and compounds (*imale*). The Ottoman lands ('Rûm') had in the 1720s been under the sway of a distinctly Persian fashion ('*Acemperestî*'), Yahya Kemal's words suggest.<sup>63</sup> The verdict proposed by his slightly older contemporary Celâl Esad [Arseven] corresponds to Yahya Kemal's suggestion that 'Rûm' had been under a strong Persian influence in Ahmed III's day.

Even though it is nowadays but a commonplace to refer to the importance of Persian culture in the wider world of Islam, Celâl Esad implies the existence of closer ties between the two powers of Islam in Ahmed III's reign. In 1928 he published a study on 'Turkish art' (*Türk Sanatı*),<sup>64</sup> which describes the world of early eighteenth-century Ottoman aesthetics:

In the time of Sultan Ahmed III there existed a competition in the fields  
of art and literature between Ottoman and Iranian palaces and nobles.  
Each country felt proud of its own artists and poets, and conferred high

stations to them . . . This situation awakened a movement to the east, in the direction of Iran even in the field of the arts.<sup>65</sup>

His unspoken implication seems to be that such an orientation was also in place on the political and military level at the time. In view of the twentieth- and twenty-first-century understanding of the reign of Ahmed III as a move to the West, Yahya Kemal's conjecture and Celâl Esad's rather matter-of-fact statement appear puzzling.

The important work of Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall might in this instance be able to offer some insight into the reasoning behind these apparently very dissonant views. The Austrian historian and orientalist Hammer was fluent in Arabic, Persian and Turkish, which placed him in an excellent position to study and research Ottoman history.<sup>66</sup> It would appear that Hammer commenced his work on Ottoman history, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, in the spring of 1812.<sup>67</sup> The massive text was first published in 1827 and subsequently translated into French by J.-J. Hellert, the unsung yet highly influential transcriber of Hammer's phrases.<sup>68</sup> This French version ensured a greater circulation of Hammer's history books, and facilitated Turkish access to his interpretation of Ottoman history given that French was the predominant international language at the time and the foreign language most widely known among the Ottoman educated class. Hammer had even been an 'honorary' member of the above-mentioned *Encümen-i Daniş*,<sup>69</sup> which would seem to underline his work's position as a well-respected Ottoman history among Ottoman readers as well.

In his *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, Hammer takes great delight in recounting the minutiae of the deeds of Damad İbrahim Paşa. In the section of his text dealing with the visit of the Iranian ambassador Mürteza Kulî to İstanbul on 24 December 1721/5 Rebiyülevvel 1134, he inserts the following anecdotal account:

To give Mourteza Koulikhan a high opinion of Ottoman poetry, and to prove to him that she was a suitable rival of that of Persia, the Grand Vezir took care to send him samples of poetry called gazels upon his arrival on Ottoman territory in Erzurum.<sup>70</sup>

The Damad's initial attempt to impress the Persian with feats of Ottoman poetry was followed by this interaction during a feast given in honour of the ambassador in İstanbul:

He [Damad İbrahim] seized with no less urgency the occasion of a feast to acquaint him [Mourteza Koulikhan] with the flourishing state of arts

and sciences in Constantinople, in particular poetry, music, and calligraphy.<sup>71</sup>

Hammer's renditions of Damad İbrahim's attempts to utilise the cultural splendour of the Ottoman capital to impress the Safavid envoy appear to contain the nucleus of Celâl Esad's contention that Ottoman and Persian patrons of art had been in a particularly 'lively competition' during Ahmed III's reign. It seems obvious that Yahya Kemal would have consulted the *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* during his stay in Paris, when he developed a strong urge to research the past of 'Turkey'. And the fact that Celâl Esad was familiar with Hammer's tomes is affirmed in his *Eski Galata ve Mebânileri* (1329/1913).<sup>72</sup> He specifically refers to the Austrian historian in this little historical guidebook of the area adjacent to the Golden Horn (*Haliç*) in İstanbul, calling him '[m]üverrih Hammer'.<sup>73</sup>

A look at the material culture of early eighteenth-century İstanbul seems to confirm Celâl Esad's statement about an Ottoman move to the east in artistic terms. The art historian Walter Denny, writing in the 1980s, talks about a so-called *Saz* style as being popular in Ahmed III's reign. The stylistic, which he describes as 'virtually synonymous with the glorious days of Ottoman political, economic, and cultural strength in the sixteenth century', was revived by the early eighteenth-century bookbinder, gilder and calligrapher Ali Üsküdarî, a pupil of Yusuf Mısrî and a member of Ahmed III's re-organised *Nakkaşhane* (palace design workshop).<sup>74</sup> This stylistic form had been originally introduced from Iran by the renowned sixteenth-century designer Şah Kulu (Shah Quli).<sup>75</sup> The Saz style consists of arrangements of curled leaves with pointed edges, stylized flowers in a *Chinoiserie* (*batayî*) manner, seeds, dragons, Zümrüdüanka (a mythical bird of enormous size), legendary animals of Far Eastern origin, lions, tigers, elephants, deer, rabbits, pheasants, cranes and fairies. This design idiom was originally applied to virtually all decorations, from bookbinding through textiles, carpets, metalwork, stone-carving and ceramics. Walter Denny convincingly speaks of an Iranian-inspired form of designs in Ottoman contexts, and remarks that its use had been prominent in the reigns of Sultans Süleyman (1520-66), Murad IV (1623-39), and significantly Ahmed III (1703-30),<sup>76</sup> reigns when the Empire had been engaged in wars on its eastern front in Iran.

Joseph von Hammer mentions the presence of certain Persianate traits on an aesthetic plane during the Damad's administration as well. He relates the ambitious project of the Russian and Ottoman governments to occupy the lands of Iran following the deposition of Shah Sultan-Husayn (1694-1725) by Afghan rebels, and asserts specific cultural repercussions:

In the neighbourhood of the Eğrikapı Gate, in the old palace of the Hebdomon, today known as Tekfur Sarayı, a factory of Persian-style blue tile-work was established. After the capture of Tabriz [in 1514], Sultan Selim I had moved craftsmen active in this type of industry to the area adjacent to the lake of Nicaea, [and] these were [now] joined by those that Damad İbrahim brought over from Tabriz, at the time of the last capture of that city, and their workshops did not take long to produce glazed tiles, the colour and brilliance of which competed with those of Qum and Kashan.<sup>77</sup>

Hammer posits that the initial success of Sultan Ahmed's armies in Iran led to a renewed influx of Iranian craftsmen into the Ottoman lands. He creates a relationship between the reign of Selim I (1512-20) and the *sadâret* of Damad İbrahim (1718-30).

### Yahya Kemal and the *Fêtes galantes*

In other words, certain material remains of the eighteenth century testify to the existence of a distinctly Persian influence upon Ottoman sensibilities, arguably linked with the political and military attempt to appropriate the former Safavid dominions. One could imagine the poet Yahya Kemal, inspired by the grand authority of Joseph von Hammer, visualising eighteenth-century tilework decorated in the *Saz* style and then invoking Persian affectations (such as *imâles*) in his protagonists.<sup>78</sup> In another poem, *Mahur'dan Gazel*, Yahya Kemal indicates that the population's social activities were directed towards the summer palaces set up by the Sultan and his entourage:

While the people of Saadabad lined both shores in groups  
Applauding from afar the time of [the imperial] arrival<sup>79</sup>

These *köşks* and *kasırs*, built beyond the city-walls, invited the population to visit sites outside the city-centre. The pursuit of pleasure and enjoyment was thus conducted away from İstanbul's ancient centre of gravity. In contrast, the two final lines of the poem *Şerefabad*, the name of one of the many summer-palaces and pleasure-houses built at the time, conjure up a melancholy sense accompanying a determined pursuit of pleasure bound to end:

In his dream he looks at the leaf-covered pool  
Today this coquettish youth weeps whenever he comes  
to the palace of Şerefabad<sup>80</sup>

The leaves upon the surface of the pool are indicative of the *kasır*'s dilapidated state. Following the untimely end of the 'Tulip Age', the coquettish youth cannot but cry tears of pain visiting this once-glorious palace, scene of many a joyful diversion. Tanpınar sees this melancholy representation as reminiscent of Mallarmé's poetry.<sup>81</sup> But in view of Tanpınar's earlier reference to Verlaine and the *Fêtes galantes*, the Goncourts' appraisal of Watteau's pictures as being redolent with sadness and despondency springs to mind.

Yahya Kemal's interpretation of the latter part of Ahmed III's reign thus seems to have been a mixture of opposite impressions. Yahya Kemal portrays eighteenth-century *Fêtes galantes*, peopling them with Ottoman protagonists, rather than the elegantly-clad Parisian city-dwellers of Watteau's pictures. The poet obviously regards the era, which he had termed a 'Tulip Age', to have been one of pleasurable activity (symbolised in *kasırs* such as Saadabad and Şerefabad which functioned as the focal points for numerous entertainments). These delightful pursuits were fashioned on Persianate models, Yahya Kemal asserts. But, he then continues, the determined pursuit of refined and ornate excesses inexorably led to its sad and untimely end. Yahya Kemal's familiarity with the historical circumstances provided him with the opportunity to depict a short-lived era, full of pleasure and joy, doomed to end abruptly in the violent Patrona Halil rising of 1730. Thus he was able to endow the hedonistic protagonists of his poetic works with a melancholy sense of their impending end, a sentiment corresponding to the poetic atmosphere of *fin-de-siècle* Paris. That Yahya Kemal immersed himself in the works of Verlaine, Mallarmé and other late nineteenth-century French poets becomes evident here.

Nihad Sâmî Banarlı's account mentions how Yahya Kemal had communicated this interpretation of Ahmed III to the historian Ahmed Refik in the course of a conversation which must have taken place at some stage in 1910. Ahmed Refik had subsequently written an 'attractive' book on the topic, entitled 'The Tulip Age'.<sup>82</sup> At the time a number of renowned historians, such as Ernest Lavisse, Charles Seignobos, and Albert Vandal were active in Paris.<sup>83</sup> The Ottoman historian was clearly impressed by these French historians, as illustrated by the earlier quotation regarding Ahmed Refik's visit to Lavisse. It is at the same time possible that he came under the spell of Yahya Kemal's poetic voice in his depiction of the latter part of Ahmed III's reign. The poet Yahya Kemal seems to have been the one to coin the literary *topos* of a 'Tulip Age', which received an entirely new infusion of meaning at the hands of the Ottoman historian Ahmed Refik. Upon his return to İstanbul, the historian appropriated Yahya Kemal's phrase and turned it into a historiographical concept with enduring appeal.





## Chapter I/2

# The Construction of the ‘Tulip Age’: Ahmed Refik and his *Lâle Devri*, 1913-15

During the Tulip Age an intimacy developed between the Ottomans and the Westerners, especially the French. For this reason the Tulip Age constituted for the Ottomans a brilliant age of awakening, the first stage of the serious dissemination of European civilisation in the East.

Ahmed Refik (1331/1915)\*

### Alluding to the ‘Tulip Age’

Ahmed Refik in this epigraph outlines his revolutionary vision of the ‘Tulip Age’, the term used by Yahya Kemal to refer to Damad İbrahim’s *sadâret*. Back in İstanbul, Ahmed Refik used his connections with the popular press to publicise his ‘new’ interpretation of Damad İbrahim. He summarised his views in an article, entitled ‘Ahmed-i Sâlis Devrinde Sultan Dügünleri’, published in *Şehbal* during the summer months of the year 1328/1912, before having actually written the text of *Lâle Devri*.<sup>1</sup> At the outset of this short piece which relates the wedding feasts of the Sultan’s daughters, Ahmed Refik sets the tone of his work to come in claiming that ‘this was the first era when European civilization was disseminated in the East’. Following this radical statement — prior to 1912, no-one had ever thought of linking Ahmed III’s reign with the concept of Westernisation — he avows that the pursuit of pleasure and enjoyment had been rampant at the time as well. But he nevertheless mentions that innovations, in particular, the printing press, were being introduced. Ahmed Refik then asserts that the introduction of Western ideas made this era in Ottoman history an ‘awakening’ or a ‘renaissance’ (‘devr-i intibâh’).<sup>2</sup> This short piece, appearing approximately a year prior to the first launching of the term *Lâle Devri* as a historiographical concept, determined Ahmed Refik’s subsequent writings. In the year following his trip to Paris, he and other historians received their official appointments as members of the *TOE* (14 September 1911/1327). And in the



subsequent year Ahmed Refik started contributing regularly to the Ottoman Historical Society's periodical (*TOEM*). His first contribution dealt with Moralı Âli Efendi's embassy to the French capital (1797-1802) under Sultan Selim III (1789-1807).<sup>3</sup> This piece all but underscores that Ahmed Refik's interests as an historian were predicated on the Westernisation of the Ottomans, specifically on the Ottoman reliance on France as the standard of all things European.

As a prolific writer Ahmed Refik also regularly published articles in the contemporary popular press. Following the Italian invasion of Tripoli (28 September 1911) and the Balkan Wars (1912, 1913), the historian became closely aligned with the independent newspaper *İkdam*, which published many of his articles. The paper had been founded by Ahmed Cevdet [Oran] in 1894, and attempted to follow a pro-government line during the Hamidian era.<sup>4</sup> Concurrent with a greater Turkish awareness in the Ottoman Empire, *İkdam* published numerous pieces advocating a simplification of the Turkish language and appeared generally supportive of the ideological position of Turkism.<sup>5</sup> Following Abdülhamid's abdication, Ahmed Cevdet became critical of the *İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti* (Committee of Union and Progress), a stance that forced him to leave the country and flee to Paris following the suppression of the counter-revolution of 13 April 1909 (*31 Mart Vakası*) and the establishment of the Unionist regime.<sup>6</sup> The paper subsequently went through some difficulties, but eventually from 1912 onwards it appeared regularly until 31 December 1928.<sup>7</sup> It was a publication nevertheless highly critical of the Unionists, and thus Ahmed Refik most likely would have also tried to keep his distance from the political intrigues of the Unionists' central committee.

### Writing the 'Tulip Age'

This cooperation between the historian and the newspaper led to the first publication of the text of *Lâle Devri* during the period 9 March - 4 April 1913 / 1328-29.<sup>8</sup> This serialisation meant that every day during the space of a month, the Turkish readership was able to follow the careers of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim while keeping abreast of political developments at home and abroad. In this time of great crisis, the editors of *İkdam* truly regarded Ahmed Refik's contributions as possessing a certain poignancy in spite of their superficially frivolous subject matter. The text of *Lâle Devri* is an uneven composition, possibly a result of the fact that the historian had to furnish new instalments on a daily basis. He resided on Büyük Ada, and every day had to get his contribution to the newspaper's offices in Çarşamba. But in spite of the difficulties, he missed only one day: Thursday, 20 March 1913 / 7 March 1329.

The subsequent publication of the text in book form contains 163 pages.

The text has 66 footnotes, 40 references to Ottoman, and 24 to non-Ottoman sources. He relies on Tayyazâde Ahmed Atâ's short piece on Damad İbrahim in his *Tarih* to supply him with some background information on İbrahim Paşa's life and career.<sup>9</sup> In the footnotes, Ahmed Refik calls Atâ's book 'Enderûn Tarihi', thus apparently implicitly agreeing with Franz Babinger's assessment that Tayyazâde's books did not provide sound historical information, as the latter disparagingly called the work a 'Palastgeschichte'.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Ahmed Refik also makes extensive use of various eighteenth-century *vakanüvis*. He quotes from the works of Râşid Mehmed, Çelebizâde Asım, Subhî as well as Naimâ. The *Tarih-i Râşid* covers the period 1714-22/1126-34, and thus only partly deals with the period retold in Ahmed Refik's book.<sup>11</sup> The *Tarih-i Çelebizâde*, on the other hand, deals with the period 3 July 1722-29 July 1729/8 Zilkade 1134-3 Muharrem 1142, which covers most of the period of Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*, the actual topic of Ahmed Refik text.<sup>12</sup> This leaves the penultimate year of Ahmed III's reign (1142 AH) without a mention in the Ottoman chronicle. The composite volume *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî* (1198/1784), which Ahmed Refik refers to as *Tarih-i Subhî*, then covers the period 1143-55/1730-42, starting with Mahmud I's accession to the throne. This source thus provides information on the Patrona Halil rebellion.<sup>13</sup> The *Tarih-i Naimâ* deals with the years 1000-1070/1592-1660, and thus would appear to be totally irrelevant. But Ahmed Refik cites Naimâ in support of some of his arguments regarding the position of the *ulema* (religious and legal scholars) in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>14</sup> In addition, Ahmed Refik refers to a work ('defter') written by a certain Mehmed Hulûsi Efendi, the *Şam Hazinesi Rûznameşeci* (Diarist of the Damascus Treasury).<sup>15</sup> This source is a mystery,<sup>16</sup> and in all likelihood represents a work Ahmed Refik must have discovered in the holdings of the Topkapı Palace or in the Ottoman archives (*Hazine-i Evrâk*). The remaining Ottoman sources he uses are a number of archival documents, including a *Teşrifât Defteri* (Protocol Register)<sup>17</sup> and a *Hatt-ı Şerif* (Imperial Decree).<sup>18</sup>

Ahmed Refik derives the actual movement of his narrative from various European sources. He most readily refers to a work composed by Jean-Louis d'Usson, the Marquis de Bonac, which he calls a 'Sefâretnâme'. Bonac had composed a *Mémoire pour servir à dresser une histoire de l'Ambassade et des Ambassadeurs de France, auprès des Grands Seigneurs*, which was continued by the Comte de Saint-Priest in 1777. In the late nineteenth century the French Orientalist Charles Schefer edited this text.<sup>19</sup> Arguably, Ahmed Refik means this version when he refers to 'Marki Dübönâkın Sefâretnâmesi'.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, he makes references to a number of letters written by the ambassador de Bonac to his government in Paris.<sup>21</sup> It is reasonable to assume that Ahmed Refik had discovered these missives on his trip to Paris, as seems to be suggested by his account of the conversation he had had with Ernest Lavisse on the merits of archival

documentation. In another place, he refers to Schefer's edition calling it 'Muhtıra-ı Tarihiyye' ('Historical Memorandum'). But this reference is of a more technical nature as it contains information relating to the various products traded between the Ottoman Empire and the Kingdom of France during the reign of Ahmed III.<sup>22</sup> The Ottoman historian also employs another eighteenth-century European source, which appears to provide a contemporary voice to the events described: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's *Letters*.<sup>23</sup> Finally, Ahmed Refik also makes use of the historian Vincent Mignet, whose *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* had appeared in 1771, thus arguably constituting a near-contemporary account of the events portrayed.<sup>24</sup> Greater importance should be ascribed to the two nineteenth-century French historians used by Ahmed Refik: Albert Vandal and Auguste Boppe.<sup>25</sup> Vandal had written a book on the embassy of the Marquis de Villeneuve, and Boppe had published a study on European painters present in eighteenth-century İstanbul. Ahmed Refik also refers to the Polish expatriate Kazimierz Waliszewski, active in contemporary Paris. Waliszewski wrote numerous studies on Russian history in French, and the Ottoman text uses the volumes dedicated to the life and deeds of Czar Peter the Great (1682-1725).<sup>26</sup>

With these sources Ahmed Refik portrayed early eighteenth-century İstanbul during the years of İbrahim Paşa's term as Grand Vezir (1718-30). He had ostensibly been directed to this period by Yahya Kemal, who had recognised this era as being quite different from the Ottoman mainstream. The *Lâle Devri* instalments to *İkdam* fulfil a well-defined purpose. The text concentrates on the figure of Damad İbrahim Paşa, who had been vilified by earlier generations of Ottoman historians, notably Ahmed Cevdet, Mustafa Nuri, and most recently, Ahmed Râsım. Ahmed Refik's chosen medium for the dissemination of his 'new' image of the Grand Vezir is a newspaper possessing an outspoken stance on a wide variety of issues affecting the lives of the contemporary public. Ahmed Refik's text clearly adheres to a certain programme. On a purely historiographical level, one could say that this programme comprised a defence of Damad İbrahim's reputation. But placed against the background of early twentieth-century Ottoman society, the text must have also functioned as a sound-board for other more topical issues.

Ahmed Refik deals at great length with the fashion for tulips that seems to characterise the era. Taking these tulips as a starting point, he develops at great length the theme of 'zevk ü sefâ' ('pleasure and enjoyment') that had in the past been used to discredit the Grand Vezir. He was fully conversant with the extensive archival holdings of the Ottoman administration, with records of the feasts organised by İbrahim Paşa. The *Teşrifât Defteri* lists in great detail the expenses incurred on such occasions. Ahmed Refik's 'new' interpretation of Damad İbrahim does not preclude him from these entertainments and festivities.

Rather the historian recounts the occasions of ‘zevk ü sefâ’ with great relish, undoubtedly also aiming at the newspaper-reading public’s desires to escape momentarily from the grim realities of the second *Meşrûtiyet*, when defeat and suffering dominated political and economic life.

### Positioning *Lâle Devri* in Ideological Terms

Another aspect of Ahmed Refik’s underlying historiographical programme was to present an early historical precedent for the current Ottoman stance of attempting to be seen as part of the European state system. In assessing this well-rehearsed theme, Stanford Shaw describes the early twentieth-century mood in ‘Turkey’ by saying that contemporaries ‘felt that the empire simply had to modernize if it was to survive and that the West was the only model from which this modernization could be taken.’<sup>27</sup> It is my contention that Ahmed Refik employed his narrative of Damad İbrahim’s administration as an argument in favour of state-controlled moves to initiate far-reaching reforms to alter the face of the Ottoman system. The historian seems to have used his association with *İkdam*, well-known for its outspokenness, to voice constructive criticism of government policy. The account of İbrahim Paşa’s career functioned as an admonition of contemporary politicians. The first instalment, appearing on Sunday 9 March 1913, carried the following dedication: ‘[t]o our honourable, patriotic poet Mister Tevfik Fikret’<sup>28</sup>

In dedicating his text to the controversial poet Tevfik Fikret, Ahmed Refik clearly positioned himself on an ideological wavelength with a distinctly modernist and pro-Western sound, critical of a bigoted adherence to Islam.<sup>29</sup> Niyazi Berkes calls Tevfik Fikret ‘the leader of the new literary movement and almost the ideal type of new Westernist’.<sup>30</sup> Ahmed Refik intended his text as a warning against ‘the idea of Islamic domination of state and society’, in much the same way that Tevfik Fikret had written his poems.<sup>31</sup> In the early twentieth-century Ottoman Empire the polarisation of opinion gave rise to an extreme enmity between what might be called a modernist camp and the Islamist position. Tevfik Fikret’s poem *Tarih-i Kadim* (1905) led to a violent reaction by religiously inspired activists.<sup>32</sup> In this poem, written at the close of the Hamidian era, Tevfik Fikret paints an image of oppression, disclosing how throughout history the downtrodden have always been abused by those in power, by those wielding religious authority. The poem’s lines are blatant anti-war statements and point to religion as a major culprit in this respect:

Religion requires martyrs, the heavens [sacrificial] victims  
Always and everywhere blood, blood, blood<sup>33</sup>

The poet was a fervent supporter of the revolution of 1908, but rapidly became disenchanted with the development of constitutional freedom in the Ottoman lands.<sup>34</sup> As a result of his extremist stance, Tevfik Fikret became an easy target for Muslim activists. Mehmed Âkif [Ersoy] acted as their spokesman and his attacks on Tevfik Fikret were vitriolic.<sup>35</sup> The name Tevfik Fikret became identified with ideas of modernism, progress and opposition to supposedly regressive Islam.<sup>36</sup>

Ahmed Refik was a fervent supporter of the 1908 revolution, but also became disappointed with the corruption following the introduction of the Constitutional regime in the Ottoman lands. Particularly following the Unionist coup of 23 January 1913,<sup>37</sup> a month and a half prior to the publication of *Lâle Devri's* first instalment, the historian's distrust of the Committee of Union and Progress must have been palpable. After the end of the Great War, Ahmed Refik became an outspoken critic of the Unionist government, referring to them as an abusive administration in 1919, and describing their time at the helm of the Ottoman state as 'the most deplorable page in Ottoman history'.<sup>38</sup> In addition, *Lâle Devri's* dedication to the 'patriotic poet' indicates that he shared Tevfik Fikret's mistrust of the use of religion for political ends. From the initial reference to Tevfik Fikret to the depiction of Damad İbrahim's death in the course of the Patrona Halil rebellion, the text of *Lâle Devri* seems to be an indictment of the abuse of Islam at the hands of unscrupulous and blood-thirsty individuals.

### The Historical Background to the Emergence of the 'Tulip Age'

The first line of the book is very much in tune with a sensationalist bent often encountered in journalistic writing: '[t]he seventeenth century was a heartrending century of disaster for the Ottomans'.<sup>39</sup> The historian decides to supply his treatment of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim with a broad historical background. He identifies the second siege of Vienna in 1683 as the root of the Ottomans' troubles.<sup>40</sup> But rather than ascribing the descent of the Ottoman position purely to external causes, he further argues that decay had already set in during the reign of Mehmed III (1595-1603) and was exacerbated by power-hungry and reckless Grand Vezirs.<sup>41</sup> In analysing the Ottoman system prior to the onset of internal decay, Ahmed Refik concludes that 'war' constituted the Empire's 'unique force'.<sup>42</sup> Ahmed Refik apparently views 'war' purely as a power-political and economic phenomenon, in the sense that he intimates that an aggressive Ottoman foreign policy had been set up to supply a never-faltering stream of income by means of plunder and the acquisition of new territories securing additional tax revenues.

But during the latter part of the seventeenth century this policy was failing,

and according to Ahmed Refik, the continued armed conflict upset the internal workings of science and learning, arts and manufacture.<sup>43</sup> The Grand Vezir Kara Mustafa Paşa's siege of Vienna (14 July-12 September 1683) was ill-conceived, as it had only been undertaken to satisfy his personal lust for glory.<sup>44</sup> The whole enterprise had been so disorganised that the relief army led by King Jan Sobieski (1674-96) took the Ottomans by surprise.<sup>45</sup> The Grand Vezir had been so avaricious in trying to get hold of Vienna's treasures that he had been lax in securing the Ottoman camp.<sup>46</sup> This oversight ushered in the historical retreat of Ottoman power, Ahmed Refik contends: '[t]he Ottomans' time of retreat started from this minute onwards . . . Europe, equipped with its science and learning commenced to exact its revenge on the Ottomans'.<sup>47</sup>

Ahmed Refik presents the second failed siege of Vienna (1683) in such a way as to suggest that managerial incompetence on the part of the Ottoman rulers had allowed Europe to collect its forces to exact a measure of revenge. The advantage they had possessed in earlier centuries was lost. The debacle at Vienna provided a convenient opportunity for the Europeans to display their newly-found technological efficiency, allowing them to defeat the erstwhile invincible Ottoman armies.

Ahmed Refik considers the Treaties of Karlowitz (1699/1110) and Passarowitz (1718/1130) as two milestones in Ottoman history because they initiated the partition of the Ottoman territories.<sup>48</sup> In addition, Ahmed Refik asserts, 'Europe's Great Powers' had obtained their prerogative to interfere in Ottoman affairs so as to secure advantageous results,<sup>49</sup> a circumstance which had become all but normal by the mid-nineteenth century. In this instance, he uses the Ottoman expression 'Avrupa düvel-i muazzaması', which is the Ottoman translation of the term the 'Great Powers', first used by Viscount Castlereagh in 1814, and subsequently applied to the five most powerful states present at the Congress of Vienna (1 September 1814-9 June 1815) which convened to determine the 'Balance of Power' in Europe following the end of the Napoleonic wars.<sup>50</sup> Ahmed Refik thus employs an anachronistic terminology to describe the state of power relations between the Ottomans and Europe at the outset of the eighteenth century. In spite of the calamitous nature of the situation, Ahmed Refik informs his readers that the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire or 'Turkey' had been oblivious to these developments.<sup>51</sup> Ahmed Refik also expands at length about the dual danger posed by the Habsburg and Russian Empires, indicating that the Ottomans were in a highly awkward position with enemies on both flanks. As a conscientious historian, Ahmed Refik notes the fact that the Russians and the Austrians had actually begun to divide the Ottoman territories amongst themselves, slowly dissolving the integrity of the Empire.<sup>52</sup>

### A New Ruler, a New Policy: Rehabilitating Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim

The stark reality was that the Ottomans had reached a state which precluded them from measuring up to European standards.<sup>53</sup> Ahmed Refik explains that the Ottoman military system had declined irretrievably, while the ruling classes had been preoccupied with the pursuit of hedonistic pleasures.<sup>54</sup> For this undesirable situation, Ahmed Refik prescribes the following remedy:

From now on it was necessary for Turkey to abandon its warlike policy, [and] to pursue a policy beneficial to mankind and conducive to the security of the future, and to oppose Europe with the weapons of science and learning. In part the propagator of this policy was Ahmed III's vezir Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa.<sup>55</sup>

After having proclaimed the extraordinary qualities of İbrahim Paşa, Ahmed Refik devotes some time to providing him with the proper background and characterisations, befitting the protagonist of an action-filled plot. Ahmed Refik describes how the young İbrahim had arrived in the capital (1100/1688-9) to embark upon a career in the palace, bringing him in close contact with the future sultan. These two young men developed a close relationship, eventually turning İbrahim into the prince's intimate, or 'mahrem-i esrâr'.<sup>56</sup> He found this material primarily in Tayyazâde Ahmed Atâ's *Tarih*,<sup>57</sup> which had in turn relied heavily on the eighteenth-century *Hadikat ül-Vüzerâ*, published in 1271/1854-5.<sup>58</sup> The *Hadikat* had originally been compiled by Osmanzâde Ahmed Tâib in 1718, containing an account of 92 Grand Vezirs up to Râmî Mehmed Paşa, who had been dismissed in 1115/1703.<sup>59</sup> Subsequently three *zeyls* (appendices) were compiled detailing the lives of later Grand Vezirs. The addition compiled by Dilâverzâde Ömer Efendi contains an entry on Damad İbrahim Paşa.<sup>60</sup>

At this juncture of his text, Ahmed Refik inserts an important claim regarding İbrahim Paşa's political orientation:

Consequently he wanted to set up a body of twelve thousand Nizam-ı Cedid soldiers, consisting of Albanians and Bosnians. "If perchance he were to succeed in this goal and did not face any opposition from the Janisaries, then his soldiers would be more well organised and upon his return from Iran İbrahim Paşa would be able to throw himself upon the Christians with all of his vigour".<sup>61</sup>

Ahmed Refik follows up his sentence about İbrahim Paşa's 'Nizâm-ı Cedid askeri' with a quote from an unpublished letter written by Bonac (i.e. 'If perchance he were to . . .'). He does so to imply that the French ambassador reported the 'fact' of Damad İbrahim's intention to set up a 'New Order'.<sup>62</sup> The

juxtaposition of Ahmed Refik's sentence, containing the term *Nizâm-ı Cedid*, with a phrase from an unpublished document has to be regarded as a strategy to conflate his anachronistic claim with historical reality. Ahmed Refik's school book *Küçük Tarih-i Osmanî*, published in 1327/1911-12, does not include such a far-fetched claim. Instead the textbook refers to Selim III's successful establishment of a 'New Order' in the Ottoman army, which led to his deposition in 1807.<sup>63</sup> Ahmed Refik's little propaganda booklet, entitled *Osmanlı Tarihine Dâir Nefer Ne Bilmelidir*, published earlier in 1328/1912, does not include such an anachronistic claim either.<sup>64</sup>

In *Lâle Devri* the term 'New Order' is apparently used to denote Damad İbrahim's progressive inclinations. Ahmed Refik employs the phrase as a code-word, denotative of the principle of modernisation, to suggest that his protagonist wanted to reform the Ottoman army establishment along European lines and was thus a proponent of effective Westernisation. In the late eighteenth century Sultan Selim III had successfully introduced European ideas and structures into the failing Ottoman army system. The 'New Order' he promulgated consisted of a military system borrowed from the West. As a result, in historical literature it is Selim III who is associated with the introduction of a 'New Order' or *Nizam-ı Cedid*.<sup>65</sup> Christoph Neumann declares Ahmed Cevdet to have been the first Ottoman historian to single out Sultan Selim as the Ottoman to have initiated far-reaching reforms of the Ottoman system.<sup>66</sup> In addition, Cevdet's verbal imagery of Damad İbrahim as a tulip-crazed sybarite is an explicit condemnation of the Grand Vezir's lack of zeal in reforming or re-viving the military during his term of office.<sup>67</sup>

The reference to Bonac is problematic, however. It could be that Ahmed Refik is here referring to an authentic document. But as the sentence appears out of context it is difficult to determine the topic being discussed by Bonac in this instance. Ahmed Refik repeats his claim concerning Damad İbrahim's 'New Order' at a later stage in his narrative, he there cites the Marquis de Bonac's *Sefâretnâme* as a source.<sup>68</sup> As pointed out above, this reference could arguably indicate Charles Schefer's edition of Bonac's *Mémoire*. Exhaustive attempts to locate the reference in this work, however, have proved fruitless. Charles Schefer's edition of Bonac's *Mémoire* does contain a reference to 'un régiment de hussards' that had been envisaged by the Hungarian Rakóczy to attack the Habsburg Empire to regain his principality of Transylvania (*Erdel* or *Erdely*).<sup>69</sup> It could thus seem reasonable to assume that Bonac's letter, 'discovered' by Ahmed Refik, had been dealing with Rakóczy's scheme to set up a special military corps. On the same page as the reference to Bonac's *Sefâretnâme*, Ahmed Refik includes a mention of Tayyazâde Ahmed Atâ's books to back his assertion.<sup>70</sup>

Ahmed Atâ's account of İbrahim Paşa's involvement with the introduction



of the printing press in İstanbul contains a passage relevant to Ahmed Refik's claim. But this piece of information was not mentioned by Dilâverzâde Ömer Efendi in his eulogistic entry on the Grand Vezir, which was Atâ's source. Ahmed Atâ talks about İbrahim Paşa's patronage of İbrahim Müteferrika (whom he erroneously describes as a French convert to Islam). He stresses the fact that the interpersonal relations at the highest level in Ottoman society, between a Grand Vezir and a Christian convert, led to the successful establishment of a printing press in the Ottoman capital. Atâ refers to İbrahim Müteferrika as the director of the printhouse.<sup>71</sup> He considers the activities of the supposed French convert:

... the above-mentioned [İbrahim] efendi composed a treatise on the art of war and the training of soldiers, and when he presented it to the above-mentioned Grand Vezir [Damad İbrahim], he approved of it and presented it to Sultan Ahmed, who appreciated and acknowledged its virtues and subsequently issued an order for the study of this illustrious art in the Ottoman state, so that the setting up of a standing army ("asâkir-i nizâmiyye") was commenced and two or three hundred soldiers were registered as drill masters. It came to the attention of the Janissary corps that training was being carried out in the Haydarpaşa meadow in Üsküdar, that the cannon foundry and the bombardier barracks and the sappers and miners and their subdivisions had been reorganised and that (?) authorizing powers were being expended towards the use of [these forces] (?). In the (Barrona and Muslu) rebellion which took place on the 15th day of Rebiyülevvel 1143, our soldiers were scattered and routed by the Janissaries.<sup>72</sup>

The above-quoted passage provides an interesting insight into the reasons behind Ahmed Atâ's positive depiction of Damad İbrahim. It is possible to identify the 'treatise' mentioned in this quotation as one of the books printed by İbrahim Müteferrika: *Usûl ül-Hikem fi Nizâm ül-Ümem*.<sup>73</sup> This book was written as a modern version of the traditional Islamic genre of the *Nasihât-nâme* or 'Mirror for Princes' ('Nasihât al-Muluk').<sup>74</sup> This genre had been popular in pre-modern times, containing 'advice to rulers and their executives on politics and statecraft'.<sup>75</sup> Müteferrika's *Usûl ül-Hikem* effectively contrasts the worlds of Islam and Christianity.<sup>76</sup> It is divided into three parts, the first two giving accounts of various Christian states and stressing the importance of geographical knowledge in this context,<sup>77</sup> and the third section dealing with the issue of standing armies, which had revolutionised warfare in contemporary Europe.<sup>78</sup> Müteferrika describes the different armies maintained by the kings of Christendom, their training, methods of waging war, and their military laws. Ac-

ording to Bernard Lewis, Müteferrika, in this text, 'makes clear the superiority of the Frankish armies, and the importance for the Ottomans of imitating them'.<sup>79</sup> The *Usûl ül-Hikem* stresses the pre-eminent position of the infantry in contemporary European armies, even transcribing the term into Ottoman as 'infânturiyâ'.<sup>80</sup> Müteferrika's text also appears to be the first Ottoman document to employ the phrase *nizâm-ı cedid* (the New Order) to describe the novel military organisation of eighteenth-century Europe:

Men of experience and care who have complete comprehension of military matters have considered a number of means for the Ottoman army to defeat the enemy soldiers who had become regulated and organised according to a new order ("nizâm-ı cedid").<sup>81</sup>

According to John Childs the modern, centrally controlled standing army, comprising infantry, artillery, engineers, and cavalry, was developed towards the end of the seventeenth century and dominated eighteenth-century Europe.<sup>82</sup> The Ottomans had in fact been the first to develop such an armed force as the so-called *Kapukulu Ocakları* had constituted the first example of a professionally organised permanent military body. These varied salaried troops (receiving *mevâcib* or *ulûfe*) consisted of the janissaries (*yeniçeriyân*), the *sekban* squadrons, as well as the *cebeci* (armourers), *tobçu*, *humbaracı* (cannoneers) and *lağımçı* (sappers and miners) regiments.<sup>83</sup> These troops, once the most efficient army in Europe and Asia, which had reached its zenith in the mid-sixteenth century, had by the eighteenth century entered civilian life as traders and peddlers selling a variety of goods in peace time.<sup>84</sup> In other words, İbrahim Müteferrika's text does indeed advocate the introduction of a new organisational framework into the Ottoman system. As a result, Ahmed Atâ's words of praise for İbrahim Paşa seem to rest on a firm footing.

The problematic aspect of identifying the 'treatise' mentioned in the *Tarih-i Atâ* with İbrahim Müteferrika's *Usûl ül-Hikem* is the fact that it was printed during the reign of Sultan Ahmed's successor, Mahmud I (1730-54). According to Joseph von Hammer's detailed reading of this source, the book was printed in mid-Şaban 1144/mid-February 1732.<sup>85</sup> As a result it would seem that Ahmed Atâ, writing in the latter half of the nineteenth century, had consulted an eighteenth-century source but failed to appreciate its exact date of publication, which led him to promulgate very far-fetched propositions. Taking the existence of this book as a starting point, Ahmed Atâ proposes that, following its successful presentation to Ahmed III, its description of the training and instruction of soldiers was used to establish an Ottoman standing army. Ahmed Atâ contends that the Sultan had issued an *irâde* (rescript) to that effect. He gives the army the anachronistic name 'asâkir-i nizâmiyye', employing the term

used by Mustafa Reşid Paşa in 1841.<sup>86</sup> Ahmed Atâ even suggests that this enterprise included the reorganisation of the cannon foundry, the bombardier barracks and the corps of sappers and miners. He provides this new army organisation with a special location in Haydarpaşa, on the Anatolian shore of the city ('Üsküdar'). Ahmed Atâ connects this apparently fabricated account with the revolution that toppled İbrahim Paşa's government and ended his life. It is interesting to note that he describes Damad İbrahim's death as a martyrdom ('şehâdet').<sup>87</sup> He claims that during the rebellion of 1143/1730, led by ' (Bâtrona ve Muslu), the Janissaries destroyed the newly organised standing army of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>88</sup>

The contemporary chronicler of the Ottoman state's life and actions, Küçük Çelebizâde İsmail Asım Efendi, devotes many pages to the issue of the military in his *Tarih*.<sup>89</sup> His volume, detailing the events of the period 1722-1728, contains a full appraisal of the Ottoman invasion of Iran.<sup>90</sup> The *vakanüvis* provides a detailed account of the habits of the Sultan and his high dignitaries in İstanbul, while simultaneously relating the events at the front in Iran. With regard to the issue of military reorganisation, Çelebizâde provides an interesting entry dealing with the issue of a *ferman* intended to restore order to the Ottoman troops (dated 1140/1727).<sup>91</sup> But this entry does not relate the setting up of a new elite troop organised as a standing army with training grounds and barracks in Üsküdar. In these pages Çelebizâde deals with the issue of the unauthorised recruitment of *Yamaks* (locally hired troops) into the Janissary corps, as well as with the breakdown of discipline among certain members of various *Ortas* (regiment). The document was concerned with reviving the traditional rules and precepts of the Janissaries, dividing the existing troops into 'a known number' of sub-sections that would allow them to act bravely during campaigns and defensive combat anew as they had customarily done in the past.<sup>92</sup>

The volume *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî*, relating to the period 1143-55/1730-42, contains an interesting account pertinent to Atâ's claim that a military training ground had been set up in Üsküdar in the eighteenth century. In his seminal *Development of Secularism in Turkey*, Niyazi Berkes provides an interesting reading of this account pertinent to the reign of Mahmud I (1730-54). The year following the accession of Mahmud I (1731), the French renegade the Comte de Bonneval, who had been residing in Sarajevo since 1729, was called to the capital. In İstanbul Bonneval, who had converted to Islam and adopted the name Ahmed, was ordered to reorganise a corps of bombardiers (*humberacı*), a unit that had been originally set up under Mehmed II (1451-81).<sup>93</sup> Ahmed Paşa established a barracks in Üsküdar, where he started training this new army unit. Niyazi Berkes convincingly states that '[a]ctual measures to introduce something new into the military training date from the work of De Bonneval'.<sup>94</sup> He elaborates by saying that '[t]he most important development

in the introduction of new military techniques was the opening in Üsküdar in 1734 of a school called *Hendesehane* . . . to train military engineers.<sup>95</sup> Even though Berkes is aware of Atâ's claims, he does not give any credence to the Ottoman bureaucrat's assertion that innovations of this kind had been introduced by Damad İbrahim.<sup>96</sup> Ahmed Atâ's story of Damad İbrahim's end bears a certain resemblance to the narrative of Selim III's downfall at the hands of the conservative Janissaries, fearing the consequences of the establishment of the *Nizâm-ı Cedid* in the early nineteenth century.<sup>97</sup> And Selim III had also set up a *Humbarahâne* barracks in Hasköy on the Golden Horn in 1206/1792.<sup>98</sup> It seems that Ahmed Atâ conflated events taking place during the reigns of Ahmed III (1703-30), Mahmud I (1730-54) and Selim III (1789-1807) in the section of his book dealing with İbrahim Müteferrika's *Usûl ül-Hikem* (1732).

The end result of Ahmed Atâ's reliance on İbrahim Müteferrika's book is nonetheless that the name of Damad İbrahim is brought into direct connection with the idea of modernising the Ottoman military structure in Ahmed Refik's *Lâle Devri*. The historian could have been equally swayed by Atâ's use of the term 'asâkir-i nizâmiyye' to insert the phrase *Nizâm-ı Cedid*, apparently going back Müteferrika himself, into his text.

### **Building a Statement: The Çeşme in Front of the Bâb-ı Hümayûn**

Ahmed Refik spends numerous pages describing the Sultan's extensive architectural patronage and his fondness for laying out tulip gardens. He presents Damad İbrahim as supportive of the Sultan's architectural projects. The Sultan and his vezir supplied the city of İstanbul with a wide array of elegant monuments, but primarily restored existing buildings that had fallen into disuse and dilapidation.<sup>99</sup> Ahmed Refik maintains that Ahmed III moved away from commissioning mosques and instead concentrated on the proliferation of domestic architecture.<sup>100</sup> The Sultan's most striking addition to İstanbul's architectural landscape was the 'çeşme' (or fountain) he had erected in front of the palace gates, the *Bâb-ı Hümayûn*:

The most distinguished among these monuments was this fountain, worthy of being called the colourful jewel of Ottoman architecture. This fountain had been built in front of the gate of the imperial palace. The fountain's layout and decoration were executed in the Arab style. The floral decoration that has been applied to it[s surface] counts amongst the most outstanding examples of Oriental art.<sup>101</sup>

Ahmed Refik employs his appreciation of the Sultan's architectural patronage to suggest the highly civilised character of the Sultan and his attempts to beau-

tify the city. This 'çeşme' was in actual fact a water-reservoir that also functioned as a water-dispenser.<sup>102</sup> Ahmed Refik discloses that this building served as a model for other fountains set up in different parts of the city.<sup>103</sup>

The most striking aspect of Ahmed Refik's treatment of this building is his verdict on its stylistic appearance as a masterpiece of Oriental art. The author proclaims the fountain's layout and decoration to have been executed in the 'Arab style'.<sup>104</sup> As mentioned earlier, Ahmed Refik had been much influenced by the work of various French scholars. In particular, the historian Charles Seignobos, whom Ahmed Refik had met in Paris, here seems to have had a profound impact on his thinking. The Sorbonne professor Seignobos had been an advocate of 'Germanic positivist rigour in French academic circles'.<sup>105</sup> This trait must have made the French historian quite attractive in the eyes of the Young Turks who admired the efficiency of the German Empire.<sup>106</sup> In the course of the year 1328/1912-3, Ahmed Refik published the text of his *Lâle Devri* in the newspaper *İkdam*, but he also translated Seignobos' *Histoire de la civilisation*.<sup>107</sup> In his 21 May 1936 interview for *Perşembe Dergisi*, Ahmed Refik told Feridun Kandemir that he had become interested in history after having read this book.<sup>108</sup> The broadly-conceived *Histoire de la civilisation* deals with the Occident and the Orient, and devotes quite a few pages to Arab civilisation, calling it 'profondement orientale'.<sup>109</sup> In other words, Seignobos equates the terms Arab and Oriental.<sup>110</sup> In dealing with the material culture of the Arabs, which he calls '[I]'art arabe', Seignobos describes their architecture as 'légère, élégante, fragile', as having produced buildings that 'donne l'impression d'un cartonage'.<sup>111</sup> And he characterises the decorative idiom employed by Arab artists and artisans as 'de plus en plus compliquées et d'apparence fantastique'.<sup>112</sup> Seignobos's insights on Arab art, architecture and civilisation inspired Ahmed Refik's descriptive treatment of Ahmed III's fountain.

On account of his reliance on the French authority Seignobos, Ahmed Refik's proclaims that Ahmed III's *çeşme* in front of the *Bâb-ı Hümayûn* was a masterpiece of Oriental art, which is a verdict is very close to the traditional Ottoman appraisal of the building. During the reign of Sultan Abdülaziz (1861-76) the Ottoman government published a book containing a definite judgement on the structure, proclaiming similar views avoiding, however, the term 'arab'. The occasion of the World Exposition of 1873 at Vienna had induced the Ottoman government to produce a book depicting the cultural identity of the Ottoman Empire in architectural terms: the *Usûl-i Mîmârî-i Osmani*, published in Ottoman, French and German.<sup>113</sup> The fountain in front of the *Bâb-ı Hümayûn* is described as a masterpiece of Ottoman architecture:

... one of the most beautiful expressions achieved by [Ottoman] art up to the present is the fountain of Ahmed III . . . As is well-known, this

splendid monument is due to Sultan Ahmed III, who created and designed it himself and decorated it with verses of his own composition, sculpted in letters of gold on the marble slabs which embellish the four fronts of the fountain. One can thus see that, hardly more than a century ago, Ottoman art in the city of İstanbul itself was still at the height of its vigour.<sup>114</sup>

Ahmed Refik's verdict on the monument is very close to this 'official' opinion on the nature and appearance of the *çeşme*. The historian's reliance on Seignobos' book, however, must have induced him to insert the word 'arab' into his appreciation of Ottoman culture and civilisation. The use of the term 'arab' was probably highly charged at the time. Ahmed Refik first aired this rather crucial claim on Thursday, 13 March 1913 (28 February 1328) in *İkdam*.<sup>115</sup> Particularly if one keeps in mind, as expressed by his contemporary Halide Edib [Adıvar], that, 'from 1912 on, [a]n open nationalistic movement among the Arabs had been apparent'.<sup>116</sup> But in the end, the *Usûl-i Mimârî-i Osmani* as well as Ahmed Refik call Ahmed III's *çeşme* in front of the *Bâb-ı Hümayûn* an Oriental masterpiece.<sup>117</sup>

Ahmed Refik utilises this instance of imperial patronage to return to the story of his original protagonist, Damad İbrahim Paşa. He affirms that the Grand Vezir also commissioned his share of new buildings in such locations as Kâğıthane, HocaPaşa and his hometown Muşkara, renamed Nevşehir. These constructions consisted of mosques, schools, bath-houses and libraries.<sup>118</sup> But in view of the fact that the Sultan derived the greatest enjoyment from the construction of Saadabad, Damad İbrahim spent most of his energies on reviving the delightful area of Kâğıthane.<sup>119</sup> Like Ahmed Cevdet and Mustafa Nuri before him, Ahmed Refik stresses the Grand Vezir's involvement with the revitalisation of this area. Damad İbrahim's enthusiasm was such that he even obliged the workers to continue during the feast held to commemorate the end of the fast.<sup>120</sup> The course of the stream was altered, constructing a canal with two marble quays. Then, the workmen built a magnificent imperial summer-palace, placed on thirty pillars, at the edge of this waterway. A large pool was laid out facing the building, containing cascades and spewers in the shape of dragons spouting water as well as various other waterjets.<sup>121</sup> All along the canal, the Damad had numerous elegant summer-palaces and hamams laid out.<sup>122</sup> The whole process was completed in the space of sixty days.<sup>123</sup> İbrahim Paşa himself composed a poem commemorating the date of its construction and providing the name Saadabad: 'Mübârek Ola Sultan Ahmede Devletle Saadabad'.<sup>124</sup> But Ahmed Refik did not provide an exact date for the event, which seems to have taken place in the month of Şevval 1334 / July-August 1722.<sup>125</sup>

### The City of İstanbul: The Meeting of East and West

Ahmed Refik's account of the architectural activity during the 1720s posits a crucial claim regarding the relationship between Ottomans and Europeans:

Building work was now continuing in every corner of İstanbul. Many architects were being summoned to İstanbul from Europe and from Asia, and the buildings were being constructed in a variety of architectural styles. The buildings that were built in this fashion now used the style of Versailles, and now that of Isfahan ("gâh (Versay), gâh (İsfahan)"). The plans for the köşks had been brought from Paris by Monsieur Lenoir, the translator of the French Embassy, who furthermore even wrote a book describing İstanbul at that time.<sup>126</sup>

This quotation contains a wealth of information that would have seemed contentious to the contemporary reader. In the late nineteenth-century, the *Usûl-i Mimârî-i Osmanî* had depicted Ahmed III as the last Ottoman sultan to have safeguarded the architectural integrity of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>127</sup> Traditional Ottoman opinion did not associate the reign of Ahmed III with the adoption of European aesthetics in the field of architecture.

In contrast, Ahmed Refik's indicates that the architectural landscape of İstanbul had become subject to a direct French intervention in the early eighteenth century, stating that the French royal palace of Versailles functioned as an architectural template. At the same time, he also indicates that a certain Persian influence was present, referring specifically to Isfahan. Ahmed Refik pronounces the phrase 'gâh (Versay), gâh (İsfahan)' to hint at both inspirations. But, his conclusion seems to be that Damad İbrahim's commission of the French embassy official Monsieur Lenoir to furnish architectural plans from Paris was of exceptional importance. Ahmed Refik makes these strong and rather surprising statements without citing any authority or source to back his claims. The *Usûl-i Mimârî*, on the other hand, states unequivocally that Sultan Ahmed's successors had supervised the downfall of Ottoman architecture, as these patrons had allowed 'Le style Pompadour' to infiltrate the Ottoman lands. The *Usûl-i Mimârî* disparagingly characterises this latter era in Ottoman building as 'le temps des pompons, des chicorées et des rocailles'.<sup>128</sup>

In view of Ahmed Refik's admiration for the works of French historians, and the apparent ease with which he adapted some of their claims, his account might also provide an insight into his methodological practice. In this case Ahmed Refik had primarily relied on the views of Albert Vandal. The historian Vandal had been quite a prominent figure on the early twentieth-century Parisian intellectual scene.<sup>129</sup> He was a man fully convinced of French superiority, and a zealous advocate of France's mission to bring the rest of the world

under its cultural hegemony.<sup>130</sup> Ahmed Refik himself was very familiar with the Frenchman's work and personality, as he was to prove in a three-part article series he published during the summer of 1922.<sup>131</sup>

Albert Vandal had written four books directly relating to Ottoman topics.<sup>132</sup> Ahmed Refik consulted Vandal's work on the activities of the ambassador Louis Sauveur, the Marquis de Villeneuve, who had been in İstanbul during the years 1728-41: *Une ambassade française en orient sous Louis XV*.<sup>133</sup> The ambassador arrived in İstanbul during the last years of Sultan Ahmed's reign, but he was to be a pivotal figure during the reign of Sultan Mahmud I (1730-54), in particular regarding the conclusion of the Treaty of Belgrade (18 September 1739).<sup>134</sup> Before bursting into action, however, the Frenchman enjoyed a couple of years of ease and relaxation, stationed in the exotic capital of the Ottoman Empire. In his *Une ambassade française* Vandal sees İstanbul as a city full of eastern promise during the first decades of the eighteenth century, and he depicts it in a way that must have been quite attractive to his French readership.<sup>135</sup> Vandal is very detailed in his appraisal of Ottoman architectural patronage during the 1720s:

Architects who have come from a wide variety of countries, some summoned from the Occident, others from Asia, assemble very different [architectural] styles in these buildings, and take their models as much from Versailles as from Isfahan ("tantôt à Versailles, tantôt à Ispahan").

Furthermore, Vandal calls Saadabad 'l'imitation [de Versailles] qu'il [Damad İbrahim] en avait tentée auprès des Eaux-Douces d'Europe'. But he does not, however, refer to the figure of Lenoir.<sup>136</sup>

These quotations indicate that Ahmed Refik did not shy away from appropriating passages from Vandal into his own work. The phrase 'gâh (Versay), gâh (İsfahan)', corresponding to Vandal's 'tantôt à Versailles, tantôt à Ispahan', discloses quite clearly the extent to which Ahmed Refik's text relies on Vandal's work. Ahmed Refik probably also relies on Vandal's book in linking Saadabad with French palaces. The juxtaposition of the French and Turkish texts uncovers Ahmed Refik's uncritical attitude towards his source material, revealing that in his mind a Western provenance apparently guaranteed veracity.

At a further stage in his text, Ahmed Refik elaborates on his 'findings' by stating that '[a] small sample of the life that was lived in the (Versailles) palaces of France became popular in İstanbul as well'.<sup>137</sup> He goes even further, proclaiming that a French aesthetic had been at work in the conception of the imperial *kasır* of Saadabad. He even claims that court patronage of architectural constructions was completely subject to a desire to emulate French examples.<sup>138</sup> Ahmed Refik attempts to supply these claims with illustrative examples, and refers to forty orange trees the Marquis de Bonac had given to the Sultan who



used them to embellish the layout of Saadabad.<sup>139</sup> Ahmed Refik discovered this reference in a letter by Bonac presented in Auguste Boppe's *Les peintres du Bosphore au XVIIIe siècle*.<sup>140</sup> Boppe had in turn discovered this letter, dated 30 September 1722, in the French Archives.<sup>141</sup> This epistle was published, bearing the date of 20 January 1724, in the June 1724 edition of the *Mercur de France*.<sup>142</sup>

But Ahmed Refik's primary source for issues relating to the appearance of early eighteenth-century Ottoman culture and architecture was Albert Vandal's *Une ambassade française en orient sous Louis XV*. In spite of Ahmed Refik's ready use of the book for verdicts on the nature of Saadabad, no reference to Vandal is given here. In his book Vandal transforms Ahmed III into a decadent, melancholic and ineffective ruler:

The Ottoman court shone with a special brilliance. Ahmed [III], disgusted by the weight of [political] affairs, inclined towards that bored sadness that often functions as the necessary companion of omnipotence, sought refuge from himself in the [pursuit of] pleasure.<sup>143</sup>

And he goes on to claim that Sultan Ahmed adhered to the bloodthirsty rule of fratricide, initiated in the late fifteenth and actually abandoned in the early seventeenth century, inserting the *topos* of the tulip into his description of Sultan Ahmed as well:

[I]n Ahmed III, murderer of all of his brothers, one passion dominated all others, namely the passion for flowers. Even in the Netherlands tulips had never been cultivated with more care, had not been sought after with more love than they were in İstanbul during the reign of this prince and some of his predecessors.<sup>144</sup>

Albert Vandal depicts the Sultan as a figure commensurate with a prototype of decadent rule, occasionally encountered in nineteenth-century literature.<sup>145</sup> His primary source seems to have been the French translation of Hammer's magisterial history of the Ottoman Empire. Vandal praises the Ottoman court's splendour, and even implicitly refers to the seventeenth-century Dutch *Tulipomania*.<sup>146</sup> The reference to the fashion for tulips in eighteenth-century İstanbul seems to have been completely based on Hammer's words:

Thanks to the feasts often reiterated, the passion for flowers became the dominant taste of the people, to such a point that it soon surpassed that of a number of individuals who had at that time in France and in the Low Countries [a taste] for the cultivation of tulips.<sup>147</sup>

In his *Lâle Devri*, Ahmed Refik returns to recounting the further deeds of Damad İbrahim, after having exposed the peculiar nature of Saabadad. At this stage, Ahmed Refik introduces the theme of the fashion for tulips pervading contemporary İstanbul into his own text: '[t]ulips were the novelty [introduced by] the Grand Vezir that occupied the Ottoman arts and aesthetics for years'. This phrase appears very reminiscent of Ahmed Râsım's words used to introduce his condemnation of Damad İbrahim.<sup>148</sup> Ahmed Refik does not proceed to criticise his protagonist, but instead continues in a phraseology very reminiscent of Vandal's wording:

In no other era has it been the case that tulips were so much in demand. Nowhere, not even in Flanders [Netherlands], had it ever been known for tulips to be sought after with this degree of care and love, as much as they were in Istanbul, or for them to be so much in demand for gardens.<sup>149</sup>

In particular Ahmed Refik seems to have employed Vandal's implicit reference to the Dutch *Tulipomania*. Ahmed Refik speaks of the growing number of tulip gardens being laid out, of tulip manuals being written and of more and more tulip species being produced.<sup>150</sup>

The historian even intimates that this all-pervading fashion for tulips had also been introduced from the West: '[t]he tulip was brought to Istanbul by the Austrian ambassador İsmet fon Şivarenhörn [Johann Rudolf Schmid, Freiherr zum Schwarzenhorn] in the time of Mehmed IV' (1648-86).<sup>151</sup> Upon Sultan Mehmed IV's accession to the throne, Schwarzenhorn had been sent to renew the Zsitvatorok agreement<sup>152</sup> on 1 July 1649.<sup>153</sup> In 1650, the biographer Theodor Vetter asserts, Emperor Ferdinand III (1637-57) entrusted Schwarzenhorn with a mission to convey a unique tribute to the Ottoman sultan, a boy fourteen years of age at the time.<sup>154</sup> Vetter terms this levy a gift, an endowment ensuring the continuation of peaceful relations. Thus it would appear that Ahmed Refik supplies the neatly confined 'Tulip Age (1718-30)' with an equally precise point of origin, the period 1649-50.

### **Wasteful Expenditure and Ottoman Women**

In spite of all these positive achievements of the Damad's administration, Ahmed Refik declares that a great deal of wasteful expenditure was also present.<sup>155</sup> He goes on, particularly in spring and summer, İstanbul's inhabitants had been very keen to squander immoderate amounts of money.<sup>156</sup> According to the historian, Damad İbrahim was willing to put a halt to such waste, and his attention was drawn to the lavish and luxurious outfits

worn by women at the time. Dealing with women's outfits enables Ahmed Refik to include rather risqué passages in his text:

The thing that most attracted İbrahim Paşa's attention was women's clothes. How strange! İbrahim Paşa, [the man] who threw gold coins ("zer-i mahbûb") into women's tulle veils during the entertainments at Saadabad, [now] wanted to restrict women's attire.<sup>157</sup>

This anecdotal account seems to go back to Mustafa Nuri's *Netâyic ül-Vukûât*, and was recently reiterated in Ahmed Râsim's *Osmanlı Tarihi*.<sup>158</sup> These two authors talk at length about the games played by the Damad during his entertainments at Saadabad. Mustafa Nuri's text speaks of the fact that "İbrahim Paşa's dexterity in throwing gold coins at women and dropping them inside their veils was [well] observed".<sup>159</sup> He follows up this statement with the accusation: "[m]oreover, [Damad İbrahim] was said to have assaulted the beautiful and graceful wife of Zülâlî Hasan Efendi, the kadî of İstanbul".<sup>160</sup>

Ahmed Refik does not indicate that Damad İbrahim's games involving gold coins (called *zer-i mabbûb*) possessed a dubious moral acclaim at the time, nor does he refer to an alleged assault on Zülâlî Hasan's wife. Instead, Ahmed Refik restricts his comments to saying that men had become engrossed in the pursuit of tulips and tulip growing, while women had developed a taste for ostentatious display in the "Tulip Age".<sup>161</sup> The historian asserts that women had at the time spent a lot of money on their external appearance, and that their costumes were too revealing:

Clothes that exposed all the attractive and enchanting lines of women's elegant bodies to the gaze had given rise to such a degree of wasteful expenditure, that people felt the need to spend a large fortune on a wedding ceremony in İstanbul.<sup>162</sup>

Ahmed Refik goes on to say that this greater degree of economic freedom on the part of women led to a breakdown of the moral structure of society.<sup>163</sup> He claims that a great many women left their husbands on account of their newly developed taste for enjoyment and ostentation. The historian thus presents Damad İbrahim's concern with curbing wasteful expenditure as a response to moral decline.

On the one hand, such descriptive passages undoubtedly titillated his male readership, but they could also be interpreted as a transposition of contemporary concerns regarding the growing appearance of women in public life and the discussion of women's rights and feminism in the public sphere. The large number of women's periodicals appearing in early twentieth-century İstanbul seems

to evidence a greater public female visibility.<sup>164</sup> After the 1908 revolution the number of women joining the workforce had drastically increased, particularly in the textile sector, as well as in the industrial preparation of tobacco and cigarettes. But firm figures about the extent of female participation in the labour market in late-Ottoman Turkey do not exist.<sup>165</sup> The contemporary journalist and writer Baha Tevfik even translated the feminist Odette Laquerre's book on the women's movement under the title *Feminizm. Âlem-i Nisvân*, published in conjunction with his own essay *İslâmiyyet ve Feminizm*.<sup>166</sup> At the time of the publication of *Lâle Devri*, the issue of female emancipation and the economic independence of women was a hotly-debated topic. Ahmed Refik also contributed to the discussion with an article in *Şehbal*, in which he uses his research findings on Ahmed III's era to posit the fact that women's roles in Ottoman history had been neglected so far:

One of the topics that has been most neglected in Ottoman history, and that so far has not been researched is the life style of women in old Ottoman times, of women's influence on politics. Women's dress and ways of social intercourse [have been neglected].<sup>167</sup>

One could argue that this discourse had crept into Ahmed Refik's historical writings for the daily *İkdam*, a fertile ground for intellectual debate at the time. But while this quotation seems to disclose the historian's commitment to researching the contributions of women to Ottoman history, one could also easily claim that his serialisation of *Lâle Devri* simply contains mildly prurient passages aimed at a male audience. Rather than being serious investigations of women's roles in Ottoman history, Ahmed Refik's writings disclose his own ambivalent attitude to the issue of female emancipation as well as a strong male bias.

In his *Lâle Devri* Ahmed Refik describes outfits worn by early eighteenth-century upper-class women in great detail, basing himself on Lady Montagu's letters. He says women wore long silk *şalvars* with lacy fringes, and long-sleeved silk shirts.<sup>168</sup> The shirts were fastened with a diamond button, leaving the bosom underneath visible to the beholder, he adds.<sup>169</sup> A loose robe (a so-called 'entâri') was worn over the shirt, bound by a thick belt.<sup>170</sup> The text next considers the then common hairstyles among women, stating that long blond hair had been very much in fashion at the time.<sup>171</sup>

Following his detailed appraisal of the appearance of women during the 'Tulip Age', Ahmed Refik claims that women had displayed the same elegant way of dressing in private as well as in public.<sup>172</sup> In other words, the historian had in fact been describing the clothes women had worn indoors during the 'Tulip Age'. But still, he continues, the government had been forced to crack

down on this state of affairs ('bu hâl') in response to a growing intolerance displayed by public opinion at the time. The government was thus forced to curb women's outfits.<sup>173</sup> Ahmed Refik uses the term 'taassub' (bigotry) in this connection, which points to a certain level of religious intolerance and fanaticism on the part of the people. The historian, at this point of his narrative, introduces the concept he sees as having determined the course of the 'Tulip Age'. He claims that the population at the time was too bigoted to stomach the public display of female liberty as symbolised in women's extravagant and suggestive clothing. That the government seemed to have condoned the violation of the Islamic dress code, Ahmed Refik reasons, was not favourably looked upon by the common people, arguably the repository of public opinion. In other words, this passage clearly betrays the historian's ambivalent position on the issue of women's place in society. On the one hand, he seems to condemn greater economic freedom for women as leading to a breakdown in marriages. But at the same time, he also condemns the population's bigoted response to the greater conspicuousness of women in public, and their apparently less-restricted attire.

### **The Population of İstanbul: Reaction against Progress**

Ahmed Refik's mention of the topic of women and their place in society allows him to introduce a discussion of the dismal state of Ottoman society in the 12<sup>th</sup> century of the Hegira. He does not explicitly deal with either the wars waged in the east and the setbacks suffered there or with the Ottoman population's increasingly tenuous economic situation which was the direct result of the long military conflicts with the West (1683-1718) and the Ottomans' current entanglement in Iran (1722-30). In spite of the absence of these arguments in *Lâle Devri*, the text nevertheless indicates the emergence of a popular disenchantment with the current state of affairs.<sup>174</sup> But rather than ascribing this growing unrest solely to the population's resentment of the upper classes' self-indulgence, the historian points to underlying social reasons: '[s]ocial life in the Ottoman lands had not been subject to any kind of progress'.<sup>175</sup> Ahmed Refik paints a dire picture of a population subject to despotic rule and arbitrary government:

The whole population had lived their lives subject to the [overriding] influence and despotism, the pleasure and arbitrary whims of a sultan. Medreses had been opened throughout the country, but only [fanatic] students [of religious learning] had been reared there, and of those the ones who were partially devoid of comprehension performed no service but to sow the seeds of bigotry amongst the population.<sup>176</sup>

While commenting upon the fact that the population had been oppressed and

down-trodden, the institution of *medreses* is suddenly mentioned. These centres of religious learning had been high on the contemporary agenda at the time of *Lâle Devri's* publication in *İkdam* in March 1913. Reform of the *medreses*, to make them institutions providing the government with well-trained officials able to teach the people the principles of the faith, was an issue occupying the minds of the early twentieth-century Turkish intelligentsia.<sup>177</sup>

An intellectual such as Şemseddin [Günaltay], belonging to Ahmed Refik's generation, at the time contributed prominently to this debate. In his writings Şemseddin Bey firmly blamed the deficient *medrese* system for the dire state of Ottoman affairs.<sup>178</sup> By contrast, in an article dealing with progressive *medreses*, Şemseddin Bey points to Fatih's reign in the fifteenth century as the pinnacle of Ottoman learning and education, when scientific as well as religious learning had been taught in *medreses*.<sup>179</sup> Fatih's *medrese* organisation (*Sahn-ı Semân*) is put forward as a model for reforms to be executed.<sup>180</sup> In the early twentieth century the matter of the nature of *medrese* curricula was highly contentious, as *medrese* graduates had a direct impact on the population and its relationship with such issues as faith and modernity. On 18 September 1330/1914 the Ottoman government promulgated the *Islâh-ı Medâris* programme. This reform agenda, introduced by the *Şeyhülislâm* Üsküblü Mustafa Hayri Efendi, was apparently the result of the heated discussions and public outcries heard at the time. These centralising reforms, gathering İstanbul's various independent *medreses* under the institutional roof of the *Darül-Hilafetül-Âliyye Medresesi*, primarily entailed the teaching of exact sciences as a way of safeguarding that future *ulema* would be able to cope with the requirements of modern life.<sup>181</sup> In an interview for *Dersaadet Gazetesi*, conducted on 15 September 1336/1920, Ahmed Refik states unequivocally that the 'Turks' biggest disasters' ('ignorance and helplessness') date back to the era of Sultan Süleyman (1520-66), when they had remained 'unaffected by the age of awakening ("devr-i intibâh" or renaissance)'. The only way to rectify this situation was the 'reform of the *ilmîyye* class', the historian adds, '*hocas* need to receive a modern education together with their religious instruction', so that they can 'understand the contemporary concerns'.<sup>182</sup> Ahmed Refik's support for the government's earlier reform programme seems beyond doubt.

Following this skilful insertion of a contemporary issue into the text of his *Lâle Devri* Ahmed Refik refers to the lack of social scope of Damad İbrahim's policies. He divides the population into two classes: one layer was made up by a religious and military stratum, and the other by tradesmen and the [common] people.<sup>183</sup> Ahmed Refik declares wide swathes of the population to have been in the grip of fanaticism and ignorance ('*taassub ve cehâlet*').<sup>184</sup> This harsh social commentary on the nature of the Ottoman population seems to be yet another theme commonly encountered in the early twentieth-century Ottoman

press. In one of his articles Şemseddin Bey, for instance, also decries the *ulema* class as responsible for Muslim population's descent into ignorance.<sup>185</sup> Ahmed Refik's friend and publisher Tüccarzâde İbrahim Hilmi even published a book of his own which directly relates to the topics of *cehâlet* and *taassub*.<sup>186</sup> İbrahim Hilmi calls the Ottoman Empire the only state in Europe subject to the ill-effects of 'ignorance' and 'fanaticism'.<sup>187</sup>

In his *Lâle Devri* Ahmed Refik, in turn, stresses the bigoted and downtrodden character of the lower classes of the early eighteenth century.<sup>188</sup> Ahmed Refik is quite outspoken in his criticism of the Ottoman social system. He regards the toiling classes as having been completely bypassed by education, learning and civilisation. He continues, declaring the lower-class population to have been oppressed by the hedonistic inhabitants of the imperial palace, literally the five to ten pleasure-seeking inhabitants of the dome-covered sanctuary on Sarayburnu straddling the Bosphorus.<sup>189</sup> The word 'esir', meaning slave or prisoner, is actually used in this instance, indicating that the ruling élite had the wider population in a true stranglehold. He claims that the Ottoman rulers withheld material welfare from the wider society at large, keeping their subjects in their social position by discouraging the dissemination of education and knowledge. In other words, Ahmed Refik's portrait of early eighteenth-century Ottoman society as static and stagnant appears a far cry from the meritocratic system the Ottomans ostensibly once encouraged. Rather than presiding over a society providing opportunity and incentives to the masses, the historian argues that the Ottoman sultan and his government had done nothing but exploit the population under their care.

The historian then contrasts this state of affairs with the situation in Europe, which had seen many social improvements, only to conclude that the Ottoman population had been deprived of its 'human rights'. The population was condemned to lead a miserable life subject to despotic rule, unable to complain or rebel.<sup>190</sup> Ahmed Refik intensifies his criticism of the Ottoman system, stating that the 'despotism present for centuries' had led to a quietist attitude amongst the population — a quietist attitude which sedated any form of intellectual activity.<sup>191</sup> He continues that the upper classes, rather than working towards beneficial change, preferred to preserve the *status quo* so as to safeguard their own interests.<sup>192</sup> He subsequently confesses that even the progressive Damad İbrahim lacked the necessary fibre to 'save the fatherland ("vatan")'.<sup>193</sup> In spite of these harsh words, Ahmed Refik nevertheless asserts that the Grand Vezir tried to protect the populace from extreme exploitation by unscrupulous state officials.<sup>194</sup>

### A View of the Sultan

Ahmed Refik then discloses that İbrahim Paşa had been obliged to pander to the Sultan's 'idiosyncrasies and inclinations'.<sup>195</sup> This disclosure of Damad İbrahim's need to indulge the Sultan brings the historian to offer a view of Ahmed III:

While Ahmed III in the midst of his tulips and nightingales had been busy making lacework [and] performing needlework with his women, and [engaging in] illumination festivities, İbrahim Paşa [, on the other hand,] succeeded in stopping the [excessive] influence of women, [and] personally directed the administration of government.<sup>196</sup>

Ahmed Refik here reiterates Joseph von Hammer's description of Sultan Ahmed's close relationship with the female inhabitants of the palace, implying he was somewhat effeminate:

A great lover of women and birds, of tulips and carnations, of mirrors and illuminations, father of thirty-one children, he was the object of the most devoted tenderness on the part of his wives. He spent a great deal of his time engaged in embroidery and in gossiping with them, and amused himself by distracting them endlessly with new illuminations, tulip beds, and new meals.<sup>197</sup>

Ahmed Refik uses his reliance on Hammer describing Ahmed III in terms of an effeminate as well as ineffective ruler to stress the extraordinary character of his true protagonist, Damad İbrahim Paşa. He continues that while the Grand Vezir was distracting the Sultan, he had been personally supervising the affairs of the state, stopping women from becoming too powerful in palace circles. Ahmed Refik seems to think of instances of female influence through intrigue and conspiracy as times when the domestic affairs of the sultan had exerted control over the state's affairs. He was to devote numerous studies to this topic in later years, employing the phrase 'Kadınlar Saltanatı' or 'Rule of Women'.<sup>198</sup> The historian seems to have regarded the ascendancy of the imperial *harem* as characteristic of the seventeenth century. But, he assures his readers, Damad İbrahim had effectively put a stop to that nefarious state of affairs in the early eighteenth century.

### Patrona Halil, İspirizâde and Zülâli Hasan

In the above-mentioned passages Ahmed Refik introduces the elements he judged to have led to the rebellion which ended the beneficial yet ineffective



'Tulip Age'. Having earlier underlined the ignorant nature of İstanbul's populace, the text states that because of this, members of İstanbul's lower classes would not have been able to topple the Sultan and his government on their own. The rebellious populace needed leadership. The book *Lâle Devri* singles out two separate groups in Ottoman society as guilty parties: the Janissaries and the *ulema*.<sup>199</sup> Ahmed Refik's contention that Damad İbrahim intended to set up a *Nizâm-ı Cedid* unit of soldiers is used to explain further the compliance of the Janissaries at this time, reiterating Tayyazâde Ahmed Atâ's earlier reasoning.<sup>200</sup> Again a bleak picture of Ottoman society emerges. The historian says that in the fields of learning and public opinion no evidence of solidarity was to be found in 'Turkey'. The people had not developed sentiments conducive to such notions as 'mutual assistance' or 'preservation of the law'.<sup>201</sup> Instead society was fragmented. He argues that the bulk of society had been dependent on government assistance in the form of 'salaries' or 'hand-outs' by the upper classes.<sup>202</sup> The historian thus maintains that Ottoman society had been stagnant and its economic life static. Further, he asserts that the development of individual wealth through private enterprise was not encouraged, which led to the fact that members of the public remained without aspirations. For Ahmed Refik Ottoman society had been a government-dominated entity, bypassed by the development of capitalism and the principle of the accumulation of wealth this entailed. European society had evolved in this direction for a number of centuries, and arguably, Ahmed Refik implies that the nature of Ottoman society had hampered its progress in the direction of a capitalist system as practised in the West.

The historian then remarks in a rather off-hand manner that this system led to government oppression of the people, so that the actual nature of the government did not affect the population as they had always been maltreated by their leaders.<sup>203</sup> After having painted the people in such gloomy colours, Ahmed Refik claims that the mere fact that the *ulema* and the Janissaries participated in occasional risings<sup>204</sup> constituted proof of the presence of bigotry and chaos among the Ottoman population.<sup>205</sup> This leads him to proclaim that revolts in the Ottoman Empire had never had the nature of a political revolution, as intellectual development and social change had been totally absent in the Ottoman sphere.<sup>206</sup> Ahmed Refik is probably thinking about the French revolution in this context, and has to admit that such a momentous insurrection had never taken place in the Ottoman Empire. In contrast, he sees a parallel between the Patrona Halil revolt and the *31 Mart Vakası*, as he stresses the insidious role played by certain members of the religious classes in the uprising.

On 13 April 1909/31 March 1325, the reinstated constitutional regime in the Ottoman lands had been nearly brought to an early end by a religiously inspired rising.<sup>207</sup> David Farhi declares that '[g]roups of soldiers belonging to

the First Army Corps, assisted by a throng of ‘civilians, students of *medreses* (*softias*) and *bocas*,’ closed in on the parliament building ‘uttering the cry: “We want *Şeriat!*”’.<sup>208</sup> In the early twentieth century the revolt was foiled by the intervention of the so-called *Hareket Ordusu*, leading to Abdülhamid II’s deposition and the accession of Sultan Mehmed V [Reşad] on 27 April.<sup>209</sup> The early eighteenth-century revolt had no such happy ending. Ahmed Refik goes on to outline the way in which the hapless population had been manipulated by various forces. The text maintains that revolutions in the Ottoman Empire had always been effected through appeals to the population’s piety.<sup>210</sup> In this instance, Ahmed Refik appears to share the views earlier propounded in Ahmed Râsim’s *Osmanlı Tarihi*.<sup>211</sup>

The 1143/1730 rebellion was no exception, Ahmed Refik claims.<sup>212</sup> The historian identifies the individuals Patrona Halil, Manav Muslu and Kahveci Ali as leaders of the rabble. But, he continues, these three members of İstanbul’s lower classes had merely ‘seduced’ the population into revolt.<sup>213</sup> Ahmed Refik then goes on to disclose that the whole event had been ‘managed’ behind the scenes by more respected members of Ottoman society:

But two people managing in an underhand way the mass of ignorant people determined to topple Ahmed III from his throne; they were the preacher of the Ayasofya, İspirizâde, and the kadı of İstanbul the Albanian Zülâlî Hasan Efendi.<sup>214</sup>

In his earlier published history Ahmed Râsim, following Mustafa Nuri, relates an anecdotal account which provides a possible reasoning for Zülâlî Hasan’s implication. These earlier texts accused Damad İbrahim of having ‘mollsted the wife of the kadı of İstanbul Zülâlî Hasan employing a number of deceptive tricks.’<sup>215</sup> The Austrian Joseph von Hammer, on the other hand, basing himself on the volume *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî* (1198/1784), actually also points to these two members of the *ulema* as major culprits: ‘Soulali-Efendi et le scheikh de l’Aya-Sofia, Iperizadé, tous deux, instigateurs de la révolte.’<sup>216</sup> In blaming the two *ulema*, Ahmed Refik seems to have based himself on Hammer, who relied on an authentic eighteenth-century source.

Ahmed Refik is highly critical of these eighteenth-century *ulema*, claiming they spread slanderous rumours concerning İbrahim Paşa amongst the population, while disturbing news from the Iranian front was seeping into the city.<sup>217</sup> It seems odd that the text earlier neglected to talk about the Russo-Ottoman attempts to divide the territories of Iran, introducing the topic of the wars in the east at this late stage in his narrative. This discloses his concern to depict Damad İbrahim’s *sadâret* as a peaceful era when beneficial policies were being developed. But, the text continues, some *ulema* were not content with the Damad’s ways:

While these encouragements of the rebellion were taking place, members of the honourable *ulema* no longer able to withstand İbrahim Paşa's nepotism were talking about the paşa's extravagance, his wealth, the fact that he had made impertinent remarks to women, [and] that he was trampling upon the rights of the nation.<sup>218</sup>

In addition to listing the *ulema's* misgivings concerning Damad İbrahim's corruption and his excessive opulence, Ahmed Refik at this stage appears to echo somewhat the words of Mustafa Nuri and Ahmed Râsim. Rather than giving full credence to the accusation that the Damad had behaved in an immoral fashion, he merely mentions that his accusers claimed that the vezir had molested certain women, not specifically mentioning Zülâlî Hasan's wife, and had thus acted in a way contrary to the commonly accepted rules of propriety centred around the nucleus of the family.

The historian employs two words to summarise the motives of the rebels: 'menfaat ve intikâm' ('self-interest' and 'revenge').<sup>219</sup> In other words, rather than calling the 1143/1730 rebellion an event set in motion by ideological motivations or moral concerns, he cynically characterises its participants as individuals governed solely by greed and selfish emotions. This statement is refined in such a way as to suggest that the population's piety had been abused by the leaders of the rebellion to further their own cause.<sup>220</sup> Even though Ahmed Refik convincingly lays the blame at the *ulema's* feet, he does not extend his criticism of these Muslim scholars to the whole of Islam. Rather than claiming that the religion of Islam was to be blamed for hampering progress, he condemns certain members of the *ulema* as scheming individuals, only interested in their personal gains. As the issue of *medreses* and higher education was high on the contemporary agenda, in equal measure, the suitability of members of the religious classes had also been the subject of public debate in early twentieth-century 'Turkey'. The historian again seems to have transposed an early twentieth-century concern to an early eighteenth-century situation.

### The End of the Tulip Age

On the day of the rebellion, Thursday 15 Rebiyülevvel 1143 / 28 September 1730, the Sultan and members of his government had either been in Üsküdar with the army, or tending their tulips and carnations at their shoreline residences, according to Ahmed Refik.<sup>221</sup>

Subsequently, the rebel leader Patrona Halil easily held sway over the city, and against this threatening backdrop a meeting took place between the 'true instigators' ('hakikî müşevvikleri') of the event, İspirizâde and Zülâlî Efendis, the *Şeyhülislâm* and other members of the *ulema*.<sup>222</sup> Ahmed Refik here obvi-

ously relies on Hammer's view, even staying somewhat close to his above-quoted phraseology ('instigateurs'). The rebels indicated that their primary targets were Damad İbrahim and his henchmen.<sup>223</sup> In response, Ahmed III allowed the execution of İbrahim Paşa and his associates, giving in to the demands of the rebels:

In the end, rather than be separated from this flowery and colourful life, he saw fit to sacrifice his vezirs . . . he sent İbrahim Paşa together with his steward and the Kapudan Paşa to the Orta Kapû. That night, in the dark rooms of the Orta Kapû, between [its] damp walls Ahmed III's boon companions were being smothered to death by executioners.<sup>224</sup>

After Damad İbrahim's body had been dragged in dishonour back to the palace, İspirizade Efendi announced that the rebels wanted the Sultan to abdicate in favour of his nephew Mahmud. The whole scene depicting the actual withdrawal of Ahmed III from his throne is well worth quoting in full:

Ahmed III fulfilled this painful task with a [sense of] deep sadness. Directing his dispirited looks at his brother's son, with a trembling and agitated voice he said: My son! Your deceased father Mustafa II and I, merely because we submitted [ourselves completely] to our vezirs, because we left any matter to them, we have fallen from this throne you are now ascending. Learn a lesson from our example. Don't fall under the sway of your vezirs. Don't leave everything to them. See for yourself and understand. Try to avoid situations such as those which have rendered us weak and destitute. Be forceful, yet just. Farewell. My life and those of my children are entrusted to your care.<sup>225</sup>

Ahmed Refik paints the scene in great detail, even giving *verbatim* the words of advice Sultan Ahmed uttered to Mahmud.

In spite of the fact that he was a diligent researcher of unprinted materials in the Ottoman archives and palace holdings, in this instance Ahmed Refik quotes the Sultan's supposed words from the work of the French historian Vincent Mignot.<sup>226</sup> Vincent Mignot's *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, published in 1771, had already in the eighteenth century been the subject of some harsh comments. Giambattista Toderini, for example, claimed that Mignot had based great parts of his book 'sur des fausses relations & sur des fausses idées'.<sup>227</sup> The anti-Bourbon author Charles Marie d' Irumberry, the Comte de Salaberry equally familiar to Ahmed Refik, was also critical of Mignot as a trustworthy source.<sup>228</sup> Nevertheless, the Ottoman historian had apparently decided to include the above relation of Sultan Ahmed's farewell speech, as it renders quite

a picturesque touch to the account of the end of his reign and Damad İbrahim's tenure at the head of the Ottoman state.

In his *Lâle Devri* Ahmed Refik provides a postscript detailing the way in which the rebels attempted to erase the memories of Damad İbrahim.<sup>229</sup> The rebels' hold on power had been such that they even demanded the complete destruction of the layout at Kâğıthane, employing the offices of their newly appointed *Kadı* of İstanbul, Deli İbrahim.<sup>230</sup> Mahmud I objected to the burning of the buildings, so that the rebels sufficed in simply damaging the structure of Saadabad.<sup>231</sup> In the nineteenth century, Ahmed Cevdet inserted the *topos* of the destruction of Saadabad into his narrative. His text does not name the figure of the *kadı*, merely describing him as a madman. The *Tarih-i Cevdet*, however, does not indicate that the rebels had not been successful in their design:

As the *kadı* of İstanbul appointed by the rebels was a totally insane person, and had issued a meaningless order after the events, the gardens and lofty palaces at Kâğıthane were razed to the ground, and a great scandal was thus perpetrated in the eyes of foreign observers.<sup>232</sup>

Cevdet's claim that the whole layout at Kâğıthane had been destroyed in the rebellion has become one of the stock *topoi* of the 1730 rebellion. Ahmed Cevdet here seems to disclose a somewhat more nuanced understanding of the Ottomans' international relations. In fact, his end-verdict seems to be a transposition of nineteenth-century Ottoman circumstances to his relation of an early eighteenth-century event, rather than a rendition of an eighteenth-century account which details Saadabad's destruction. Ahmed Refik, on the other hand, bases his account directly on the *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî* (1198/1784), to which he refers as 'Tarih-i Subhî', similar to Hammer's reference. He even reproduces Mustafa Sâmî's record of the wording of an imperial writ, adding an authentic voice to the rendition of the events surrounding Saadabad and its attendant structures.<sup>233</sup>

### **Conclusion: The Message of *Lâle Devri***

The serialisation of the text of *Lâle Devri* in the newspaper *İkdam* meant that Ahmed Refik's text was riddled with repetitions and sensationalist pronouncements aimed at luring the reader into following the account of Damad İbrahim's exploits on a daily basis. The repetitions also function as a reminder of claims printed earlier, but of major importance in the development of Ahmed Refik's argument. The text thus appears as an uneven and disparate entity in the end. The poet Halit Fahri Ozansoy, who in 1919 had published a periodical significantly called *Nedim*, suggests in his obituary of Ahmed Refik in 1937 that the

historian has to be regarded first and foremost as a 'good writer'.<sup>234</sup> In other words, the implication is that Ahmed Refik's methodology in his writings was not determined by a rigorous historical criticism, but rather by a desire to capture the reader's imagination. In the same year the politician Hasan Âli Yücel, who was to become minister for culture and education (*Maarif Vekili*) during the years 1938-1946,<sup>235</sup> in turn remarks insightfully that Ahmed Refik employed his historical writings as a way of expressing his criticism of current affairs.<sup>236</sup> By way alluding to similar occurrences in the Ottoman past, the historian safeguarded his position.<sup>237</sup> Hence, Yücel credits Ahmed Refik with having engendered a particular type of history writing: 'allusive history' or '[t]elmihî tarih'.<sup>238</sup> Yücel implies that Ahmed Refik's methodological rigour had been affected by a teleological approach to history writing, trying to make historical facts and events fit a contemporary agenda. During the Constitutional period (1908-18), public opinion saw Ahmed Refik as a historian on the forefront of new research and exciting history writing: '[t]he young historian of our ancient history'.<sup>239</sup> He was seen as a young and energetic researcher, breathing new life into the stuffy tomes of Ottoman history as a scholar of hitherto unknown events and details.

In view of these estimations *Lâle Devri* has to be seen as carrying various strands of meaning within its pages. The obvious starting-point for the author at the time was the Ottoman Empire's relationship with different European nations on the brink of the First World War. The text functioned within the framework of an intellectual appreciation of the Ottoman relationship with the West. It begins with an appraisal of the second siege of Vienna as having ushered in a new approach to the West. The Treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718) are put forward as momentous instances forcing the Ottomans to rethink their position. Ahmed Refik proposes a theory of Ottoman statecraft somewhat reminiscent of Paul Wittek's theory of the Ottomans as a 'state of Ghazis serving the idea of the holy war'.<sup>240</sup> But whereas Wittek was to see this as a religious or ideological stance, the Ottoman historian proposes a more pragmatic approach.<sup>241</sup> Ahmed Refik views 'war', and particularly 'war with the West' as a power-political and economic phenomenon. His contention is that the treaties of 1699 and 1718 succeeded in making a section of the ruling élite aware of the Ottoman deficiencies in this respect. The historian argues that the Ottomans were forced to abandon their traditional principle of armed conflict with the West. He reasons the political and military developments in the second half of the seventeenth century forced the Ottomans to re-invent their own self-image. The age of armed conflict had come to an end to be replaced by a rivalry in the fields of science and learning.<sup>242</sup>

In fact, Ahmed Refik attempts to supply a historical precedent for the current position that saw the Ottoman Empire or 'Turkey' functioning within the

framework of Europe. The government was trying to put the Ottoman Empire on an equal footing with the nation states of Europe, as part and parcel of the same culture and civilisation. Ahmed Refik's writings thus carry a distinctive stamp. As a result of his legendary interaction with Yahya Kemal, he discovered the latter part of Ahmed III's reign to be different from the mainstream of Ottoman history. Following the disasters of Karlowitz and Passarowitz, he claims that Damad İbrahim Paşa decided to pursue a peaceful course. Ahmed Refik proposes that this twelve-year tenure of relative peace and tranquillity, conveniently ignoring the wars in the east, witnessed the first application of the resolve to alter the Ottoman policy. He insinuates Damad İbrahim's intention to take the Ottoman state's ship into western waters. Rather than being portrayed as an Ottoman imbued with a warlike attitude, Damad İbrahim is depicted as a proponent of peaceful relations with the West, and thus as a Grand Vezir with a modern attitude to international relations, parallel to the current stance of the government, one could argue.

Ahmed Refik uses the Ottoman embassy to Paris in 1722 as an important argument in his appreciation of Damad İbrahim as an enlightened 'politician'. Even though he does not deal extensively with Yirmisekiz Çelebi in his *Lâle Devri*, the figure of the Ottoman ambassador arguably fulfils a crucial role in the narrative of Damad İbrahim's supposed quest for progress and modernity.<sup>243</sup> Related to the Paris embassy, the historian next moves on to Damad İbrahim's patronage of the printing press in the Ottoman Empire, in the year '(1141)', corresponding to 1728.<sup>244</sup> Ahmed Refik emphasises the contributions of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's son Mehmed Said Efendi and of the convert Müteferrika İbrahim Ağa in this matter. And he further claims that the Ottomans felt an urgent need for establishing a printing press at the time.<sup>245</sup>

Ahmed Refik had some impressive predecessors to strengthen his claims regarding the importance of the establishment of a printing press in eighteenth-century İstanbul. In the summer of 1911, the Hungarian Imre Karacsón, an honorary member of the *TOE* ('âza-ı fahrî'), had published an article on the important role of İbrahim Müteferrika, as a 'Hungarian convert', in the establishment of a press in İstanbul. Karacsón uses the word 'teceddüd' ('renewal' or more specifically 'renaissance') in connection with the effects of Damad İbrahim's patronage of print in İstanbul.<sup>246</sup> The late nineteenth-century Ottoman history textbook *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniyye*, intended for use in the curriculum of the *İdâdiyye* (secondary) schools, also contains an appraisal of the appearance of print in Ottoman İstanbul.<sup>247</sup> The textbook had been composed by the current chairman of the *TOE*, Abdurrahman Şeref. The portion carrying the sub-heading 'The Administration of Damad İbrahim Paşa' ends with the announcement that Damad İbrahim enriched the Ottoman Empire with the establishment of a printing press, which he calls the 'most bene-

ficial of progressive inventions'.<sup>248</sup> Abdurrahman Şeref had probably come across such a positive assessment in Hammer's *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*. Hammer ends his account of the printing press in İstanbul on a remarkably high note:

The establishment of a printing press in İstanbul, under the direction of a Hungarian renegade [named] İbrahim, is one of the characteristic traits of this era that is distinguished above all by a marked influence of occidental habits on those of the Orient, and a close connection of Ottoman politics with those of Europe.<sup>249</sup>

As a result of the impact of the statements of these impressive authorities, Ahmed Refik feels secure in claiming that Damad İbrahim wanted to introduce European means of communication into the Ottoman Empire. The earlier scholars had after all provided such a strong endorsement of the idea of Damad İbrahim as a reformist.

Ahmed Refik hints at a number of further cases indicative of the Damad's progressive leanings. While relating the extensive architectural programmes initiated by the Grand Vezir, Ahmed Refik inserts the fact that Damad İbrahim had set up a fire-brigade. This fire-brigade was led by a French renegade called Gerçek Davud Ağa.<sup>250</sup> The historian must have discovered an account of this enterprise in Çelebizâde Asım's *Tarih*.<sup>251</sup> Çelebizâde's text indicates that the event had taken place in 1720 (1132).<sup>252</sup> *Lâle Devri* presents this as yet another example of Damad İbrahim's progressive character. Ahmed Refik also relates the Damad's encouragement of industrial tile production as a way of reviving the high-quality İznik tile-work that had been started under Sultan Selim I (1512-20).<sup>253</sup> Ahmed Refik employs the noun 'fabrika' in this context to insinuate Damad İbrahim's espousal of modern production methods, similar to his patronage of the printing press.<sup>254</sup> The historian also uses the noun in his account of Peter the Great's (1682-1725) achievements in Russia, which he mentions in passing relying on the work of the Polish historian Waliszewski.<sup>255</sup> Usage of the noun 'fabrika' thus manages to insinuate a certain affinity between the Russian and Ottoman reformers, even though his final verdict is that the Russian had fully succeeded whereas the Ottoman only partially. The historian even calls upon Lady Mary Wortley Montagu in his recounting of how the principle of inoculation as a cure for small-pox had been discovered in 'Turkey'. It seems likely that Ahmed Refik discovered this anecdotal relation in Kıbrıslı Mehmed Kâmil Paşa's *Tarih-i Siyâsi* (1910).<sup>256</sup> Even though Lady Montagu's presence in the Ottoman dominions actually preceded the strict time-frame of the 'Tulip Age', the author relies on her colourful testimony to assert that 'Turkey' had at the time not just been in close contact with the West, but had



even been able to initiate certain important new techniques in medicine.

In spite of his positive portrayal of Damad İbrahim, Ahmed Refik's text at great length describes Ottoman society as a static entity. He portrays the Ottoman population as being at the mercy of their autocratic and despotic ruler. As a result, Ahmed Refik really seems to be singing the praise of the constitutional system introduced in 1908, bringing an end to Sultan Abdülhamid II's years of absolute rule (1878-1908) ('*istibdâd*').<sup>257</sup> An important element in Ahmed Refik's portrayal of traditional Ottoman society is the role played by *medreses* and members of the *ulema*. In line with his appraisal of the downtrodden nature of the Ottoman populace, he asserts that the general mentality at the time had been dominated by 'ignorance and bigotry'. The blame for this state of affairs is firmly placed on the decadent state of the *medrese* educational system, its graduates not being enlightened individuals willing to teach the people the true precepts of religion and modern life.

Ahmed Refik even proposes a comparison with the West, claiming that the religious classes in the West had been engaged in the dissemination of antiquity's arts and science since the dawn of the 'Renaissance'. It is thus proposed that the religious orders and priesthoods of the Christian West had, since the sixteenth century, primarily fulfilled an educational and cultural role. In contrast, his characterisation of the Ottoman *ulema* is grating in the extreme, since it is claimed that members of the *ulema* had only been interested in material concerns, employing their erudite skills to coerce the population as well the sultans into expressing veneration and respect while actually pursuing a clear political agenda. But most acrimonious of all would appear to be Ahmed Refik's dismissal of the *ulema* as charlatans simply living off stipends provided by the state, without even possessing a proper profession.<sup>258</sup>

Ahmed Refik's criticism of contemporary affairs penetrates his descriptive assessment of early eighteenth-century *ulema*:

The honourable *ulema* who were supporters of the Arabic language to an even greater degree than the Arabs [themselves], did not think about how to benefit from either the philosophy, the literature, the poetry, or the natural sciences of the Arabs, in short from the accomplishments of the Arabs which would lead mankind along the roads of civilisation. As for the West's cultural treasures, in their opinion they were completely despicable and contemptible. This weakness of the *ulema* lowered their esteem and importance in the eyes of even the most ignorant people, [so that] religious rules had disappeared . . .<sup>259</sup>

At a time when the Ottoman Empire was going through extreme crises and various nationalist sentiments challenging the Ottomanist ideal were on the

increase, Ahmed Refik describes the *ulema* as sympathisers of the Arabic language, indicating their commitment to an outdated world when Arabic carried religious sanction and its usage conferred respect and honour. This stress on the *ulema*'s commitment to the Arabic language seems to insinuate their backwardness and obstinate anti-Westernism. This is contrasted by his praise for the achievements of 'classical' Arab culture, praise probably due to his intimate knowledge of Seignobos' *Histoire de la civilisation*. The historian indicates that these backward-looking *medrese* graduates had not been able to engage in beneficial activity due to their insufficient training, actually employing the term 'dinî islâhat' or 'religious reform' in this instance.<sup>260</sup>

During the Hamidian era (1876-1909), the Arab component of the Ottoman Empire had arguably enjoyed imperial sanction and favours.<sup>261</sup> The Sultan's alleged espousal of the Pan-Islamic cause from the 1890s onwards led to a heightened status of the Arab element in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>262</sup> The Sultan's propagation of an Islamic argumentation in defining his empire was accompanied by his patronage of such well-known Islamist figures as Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani<sup>263</sup> and the Rifa'i dervish Abulhuda al-Sayyadi.<sup>264</sup> But he also seems to have actively striven to physically integrate the Arab element into the Ottoman system by means of a modernised infrastructure and means of communication.<sup>265</sup> Sultan Abdülhamid thus tried to exploit the 'special importance' of Arabs as 'the carriers of the Islamic faith and agents of a great civilization'.<sup>266</sup> The fact that Arabic was the language of the Kuran meant that Abdülhamid assigned 'first rank' to the Arab provinces ahead of European and Anatolian parts, in Hasan Kayali's view.<sup>267</sup> At the same time, however, the creed of nationalism had not bypassed Arabs either, as at that time Arab nationalists emerged opposing the central government.<sup>268</sup> As a result of Ahmed Refik's outspoken opposition to the Hamidian system of rule,<sup>269</sup> as a prime example of a retrogressive state of affairs in an Ottoman context, he apparently extends his criticism to Arabicised members of *ilmîyye* and the unreformed *medrese* system.

The dedication of the work to the controversial Tevfik Fikret clarifies Ahmed Refik's stance. The end of the 'Tulip Age' in the Patrona Halil rebellion is directly related to the dismal state of affairs in the then *medrese* system. The historian points the finger at the preacher of the Ayasofya, İspirizade Efendi, and at the *Kadı* of İstanbul, Zülali Hasan Efendi. As a result, the 'Tulip Age' emerges as an early occurrence of progressive and modern values in the Ottoman realm. Ahmed Refik thus positions his narrative of members of the Ottoman élite and their love of flowers on an overtly political plane.



## Chapter I/3

# Calibrating the Idea of a ‘Tulip Age’: Ahmed Refik’s Publications in the Period 1915-19

Ahmed Refik’s *Lâle Devri* became a much-loved book, and went through numerous reprints.<sup>1</sup> He succeeded in creating a historiographical concept that was to have an enduring impact on the people’s imagination. But his actual achievement was transforming the figure of Damad İbrahim into a Westernist Ottoman, which was in direct contrast with Ahmed Cevdet’s image of the Grand Vezir as a hedonist that had previously held sway over the Ottomans’ historical imagination.

### *Muhtasar Osmanlı Tarihi*

Ahmed Refik’s *Muhtasar Osmanlı Tarihi*, an abridged Ottoman history textbook produced in conjunction with İbrahim Hilmi in 1330/1914-15, reiterates his views on Damad İbrahim for younger audiences.<sup>2</sup> This school book was written after he had conceived the notion of a ‘Tulip Age’. The pages allotted to Ahmed III deal with the military events of the era: the confrontation with Peter the Great on the Pruth (1711) and the wars leading up to the conclusion of the Treaty of Passarowitz (1715-18). The Passarowitz treaty is presented as a negative agreement weakening further the Ottoman position. He even commits the grave historical error of asserting that the province of the Morea was lost to the Ottomans as a result of this treaty;<sup>3</sup> but then quickly turns to Damad İbrahim as an Ottoman Grand Vezir who attempted to benefit from the ensuing peace.<sup>4</sup>

The historian claims that the Damad wanted to introduce progress into the Ottoman system through the propagation of science and education. As a way of illustrating this, he mentions the Damad’s patronage of İbrahim Müteferrika’s printing press, claiming that it had led to an increased literacy in Ottoman society at large.<sup>5</sup>

Ahmed Refik also reaffirms one of the anachronistic claims he puts forward in *Lâle Devri*: ‘İbrahim Paşa wanted to reform the army. He conceived of the idea of setting up a new army [unit] by the name of Nizam-ı Cedid (“the New Order”).’<sup>6</sup> Once again the historian champions the Damad’s westernist leanings

though his usage of the phrase 'New Order'. As a result, he introduces Ahmed Atâ's unsound conclusions into early twentieth-century classrooms.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, he affirms İbrahim Paşa's willingness to indulge the Sultan with pleasurable feasts, in the form of tulip illuminations and *helva* evenings.<sup>8</sup> In passing, he then remarks that the contemporary interest in tulips had also increased, but does not proceed to declare the latter part of Ahmed III's reign a 'Tulip Age'. It seems possible that the mildly suggestive passages in the book *Lâle Devri* might have precluded the historian from employing the phrase 'Tulip Age' in this school textbook.

### *Tarihî Simâlar*

In the same year (1330/1914), Ahmed Refik's book on various, in his view, important historical figures was published.<sup>9</sup> In his 1936 interview published in *Perşembe Dergisi*, he indicates that he started writing these 'portraits' after having read Charles Diehl's *Figures byzantines* (1906-8),<sup>10</sup> a book which includes sketches of such figures as the Empress Theodora (d.548) and Leo the Wise (886-912).<sup>11</sup> But, in actual fact, Ahmed Refik relies on the ideas of the Victorian essayist Thomas Carlyle. Carlyle popularised the *topos* of 'Great Men' in his *Lectures on Heroes and Hero-worship*, held in the 1840s.<sup>12</sup>

In his preface to the book *Tarihî Simâlar*, Ahmed Refik speaks of the closed nature of Ottoman society, which was hostile to the introduction of 'new' ideas from the West, and claims that the Ottomans had always been bigoted and ignorant.<sup>13</sup> Ottomans, he says, had mistakenly looked down upon Europe. Nevertheless a number of exceptional individuals had been able to strive towards opening up the Ottoman system.<sup>14</sup> For this reason, he argues, it is necessary to study these figures to understand the development of the Ottoman social and intellectual life.<sup>15</sup> Significantly, half of the book is devoted to Ottoman ambassadors who visited Paris, starting with Müteferrika Süleyman Ağa under Mehmed IV (1648-87) and ending with Moralı Ali Paşa under Selim III (1789-1807).<sup>16</sup>

Ahmed Refik devotes a chapter each to Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi and his son Said Efendi.<sup>17</sup> He starts off with the claim that cordial relations had been extant between the Ottomans and the French in the 12<sup>th</sup> century of the Hegira. He concedes, however, that the underlying reasons for this rapprochement were found in the Bourbon-Habsburg rivalry, and that the French were merely attempting to use the Ottomans in their power struggle.<sup>18</sup> The historian continues that at the time Damad İbrahim had been involved in internal reforms.<sup>19</sup> He also claims that İbrahim Paşa had been on intimate terms with the French ambassador, the Marquis de Bonac.<sup>20</sup> Arguably, this relationship facilitated the Damad's resolution of the issue of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre by dividing

it between the Catholics ('Lâtin'), the Greek Orthodox ('Rum') and the Armenian Christians ('Ermeni'). Subsequently, an Ottoman ambassador to the court of Louis XV (1723-74) was appointed to relate the fortuitous outcome of this religious dispute. The Ottoman Grand Vezir had even ordered the restoration of the church's dome, something the French demanded for years.<sup>21</sup> The man selected as ambassador was Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi, an official capable of representing the Ottomans in a foreign country.<sup>22</sup>

Ahmed Refik carefully employs this piece to insinuate that the Ottoman ambassador had personally witnessed the progressive atmosphere present in contemporary France. The historian paints Yirmisekiz Çelebi as an inquisitive Ottoman observer who closely investigated the many advances the French had achieved. Yirmisekiz Çelebi was quite impressed by France's canals,<sup>23</sup> but, was most astonished by the French royal palaces and their attractions:

The Ottoman ambassador was particularly bewitched during his visits to Versailles, Mödon, [and] Trianon by the harmonious murmurs of the waters spouting from the pools, and by the tall and shady trees, [and] by the elegance of the artificial villages.<sup>24</sup>

At this point, perhaps in an attempt to depict Yirmisekiz Çelebi's trip to Paris in suitably exotic hues, Ahmed Refik introduces an anachronism into his narrative, namely the 'artificial villages' of Versailles. This trait was only added to the layout of Versailles by Marie-Antoinette, wife of Louis XVI (1774-92). She commissioned the architect Richard Mique to build an 'amusement village' in 1783, where she played at being a shepherdess.<sup>25</sup>

Ahmed Refik states that the embassy was an important event in the 12<sup>th</sup> century of the Hegira, an event which had produced important reactions in İstanbul.<sup>26</sup> In particular, the historian refers to the fact that Yirmisekiz Çelebi's son, who accompanied him to Paris, took the initiative to set up a printing press in the Ottoman capital upon his return from France.<sup>27</sup> Ahmed Refik praises the embassy for having led European technology into the mainstream of Ottoman life. This, he claims, was the direct outcome of Damad İbrahim Paşa's intelligence.<sup>28</sup> Then Ahmed Refik posits the surprising claim that at the time science had become fashionable in İstanbul, so that a new intellectual class, free from any bigotry, had sprung up purely as a result of the Damad's prestige and the influence of Western civilisation.<sup>29</sup> Yirmisekiz Çelebi, Ahmed Refik assures his readers, was part of that select group.<sup>30</sup>

Ahmed Refik in this text establishes Yirmisekiz Çelebi as an intermediary in the transmission of European influence to the Ottoman Empire. In connection with the summer palace of Saadabad, he goes on to say that Damad İbrahim had been impressed by the ambassador's account of French garden

structures. The historian then introduces the figure of Lenoir, the French embassy's translator, as an equally important protagonist into his narrative. Rather surprisingly, the historian even claims that the Ottoman Grand Vezir sent this Frenchman to Paris on a mission. His assignment was to collect plans and pictures of French garden layouts to serve as models for Ottoman structures.<sup>31</sup> Even though it had been common practice in the nineteenth century for Ottoman patrons to call upon Europeans to furnish ideas and plans for architectural projects, as amply illustrated by the case of the *Usûl-i Mimârî-i Osmani* (1873),<sup>32</sup> Ahmed Refik's projection of such an attitude to the early eighteenth century appears highly anachronistic. The historian relates that Yirmisekiz Çelebi's descriptions and Lenoir's efforts led İbrahim Paşa to set up Saadabad according to French plans and in accordance with a French aesthetic:

İbrahim Paşa also benefited greatly from Yirmisekiz Çelebi's descriptions of French and Parisian gardens. Monsieur Lenoir was to send the plans and pictures of these gardens, and later the Saadabad köşks and gardens were to be set up in accordance with French taste.<sup>33</sup>

In this instance Ahmed Refik reiterates a claim he put forward in his *Lâle Devri*,<sup>34</sup> but here the Frenchman, 'Monsieur Lenoir', and the construction of Saadabad are specifically linked. The physical appearance of the imperial summer residence associated with Ahmed III is thus transformed into an architectural assertion of a government-sponsored drive to emulate Western or French prototypes. Even though he does not mention the phrase 'Tulip Age' here, the piece intimates that this period, while being marked on the one hand by hedonistic pursuits, had witnessed a first desire to emulate Western examples to overcome the static nature of Ottoman society.<sup>35</sup>

### ***Kabakçı Mustafa***

In the same year as *Lâle Devri*'s publication in book-form (1331/1915), Tüccarzâde İbrahim Hilmi released another work of Ahmed Refik's, *Kabakçı Mustafa*. This book deals with Sultan Selim III and his failed attempt to introduce a 'New Order' into the Ottoman system, focusing on the figure of the rebel Kabakçı Mustafa.<sup>36</sup> In the work's preface Ahmed Refik compares the Ottoman and Roman Empires, stressing that the Ottomans had suffered greatly from the population's backwardness, with ignorant and bigoted masses hampering the laudable efforts of their rulers.<sup>37</sup> Therefore he claims that the Patrona Halil rebellion and the revolt instigated by Kabakçı Mustafa were of a similar nature and portent, as they had both taken place against the backdrop of a stagnant Ottoman system:

... for centuries no improvement, no change came about in Ottoman minds, in Ottoman social life. There is practically no difference between the Patrona Halil rebellion of 1143 and the different stages of that rebellion and the Kabakçı Mustafa rebellion of 1222: always the same motives, the same actors, the same results, the same disasters ...<sup>38</sup>

So, by 1331/1915 Ahmed Refik had become determined to transform the 'Tulip Age' into a short-lived yet glorious period in Ottoman history. One could argue that he tries to dissociate Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim from the worst excesses of their attachment to the enjoyments of the flesh (*zevk ü sefâ*), in order to concentrate selectively on a number of elements conducive to a reading of the period as a precursor of nineteenth-century reform movements, such as the reign of Selim III had clearly been. Selim III championed the principle of modernisation openly through his promulgation of a 'New Order' in the Ottoman army.<sup>39</sup>

### *Fatma Sultan*

In December 1916/1331, *İkdam* printed Ahmed Refik's seven-part study on Ahmed III's daughter Fatma Sultan, which was based on unpublished materials and documents.<sup>40</sup> This little monograph further strengthens some of the claims put forward in *Lâle Devri*. The narrative begins by stating that Fatma's birth in September 1702/Cemaziyelevvel 1114 marked the end of the long wars that had upset the Ottomans since 1683, during a sequence of truly 'catastrophic years' ('felâket seneleri').<sup>41</sup> This blanket statement enables the historian to link the birth of an imperial daughter with contemporary political and military events. At the same time the phrase 'felâket seneleri' ('catastrophic years') also recalls another of his publications whose title, like that of *Lâle Devri*, had become part of the popular vocabulary of history.<sup>42</sup> He claims that Fatma's birth had occurred at a peaceful time, when her father sought to rule the Ottoman lands in an atmosphere of prosperity and tranquillity.<sup>43</sup> But rather than keeping the focus on Ahmed III's daughter, the text spends more time discussing the Sultan's relationship with his vezirs and their careers. Ahmed Refik talks at length about Silahdar Ali Paşa, to whom the Sultan had married his daughter Fatma.<sup>44</sup> But Ali Paşa's untimely death on the battlefield of Petrovaradin on 5 August 1716 meant that Fatma Sultan became widowed at a young age.<sup>45</sup> Ali Paşa appears to have pursued a severe domestic policy, so that his death was universally perceived as a positive development, a 'prelude to liberation'.<sup>46</sup>

The historian in this way sets the tone which allows him to deal with Damad İbrahim Paşa, Silahdar Ali's successor and Fatma Sultan's new husband. Ali Paşa is presented as a strict and highly unpopular Grand Vezir in contrast with



Damad İbrahim. Before dealing with İbrahim Paşa's policies and accomplishments, Ahmed Refik portrays the vezir as a cultured and experienced dignitary whose qualities attracted the attention of the members of the Ottoman court and government.<sup>47</sup> At the time of their marriage, in February 1717, İbrahim had been 50 and Fatma 14 years old.<sup>48</sup> The population approved of İbrahim's efforts to secure the Treaty of Passarowitz, as the continuing wars had exhausted everybody.<sup>49</sup> This peaceful era, in turn, enabled Damad İbrahim to engage in numerous far-reaching projects, from constructing a library for the Sultan in the gardens of the Topkapı Sarayı, and setting up new buildings and restoring dilapidated ones in İstanbul, to patronising numerous members of the *ulema* and poets.<sup>50</sup> This description of the Damad's proclivities seems to rely heavily on Tayyazâde Ahmed Atâ's rather hagiographic appraisal of the Grand Vezir.<sup>51</sup> Ahmed Refik claims that the population of İstanbul had been living through a prosperous and active period of peace under Damad İbrahim's administration.<sup>52</sup> Against this background of positive achievements on a domestic level, İbrahim Paşa's further aims are explained:

The moment İbrahim Paşa assumed the sadâret he started engaging in activities beneficial to the country. The Paşa's [main] idea was to be in contact with Europe, to work for the elevation of the nation in terms of ideas and knowledge . . . he encouraged the opening of a printing press . . . İbrahim Paşa, with his culture and intellect, took hold of the whole administration His political sagacity was even acknowledged by the foreign ambassadors.<sup>53</sup>

This statement is in direct contrast to Cevdet's appraisal of the Damad.<sup>54</sup> Following Ahmed Refik's rather more reserved presentation of Damad İbrahim as a partial propagator of a pro-Western policy in his *Lâle Devri*, here he claims that the Ottoman Vezir had been a determined Westerniser, striving for closer contact with Europe. In 1916/1331, Ahmed Refik employed this short monograph on Fatma Sultan to deepen further and popularise his own understanding of Damad İbrahim, which challenged Ahmed Cevdet and Mustafa Nuri's earlier condemnation of the Grand Vezir.

The historian then presents the ambassador Yirmisekiz Çelebi as the medium or vehicle through which European ideas of 'progress' entered the Ottoman capital.<sup>55</sup> The construction of Saadabad, which in *Lâle Devri* he had described as in some ways being a counterpart to the Parisian Versailles,<sup>56</sup> receives a firmer rooting in this text. Ahmed Refik self-assuredly proclaims the *kasır* to have been a copy or imitation of Versailles: '[i]n imitation of Versailles [İbrahim Paşa] realized [the construction of] the Kâğıthane *kasır*'.<sup>57</sup> This sentence seems to be a close translation of Vandal's 'imitation [de Versailles] qu'il

[Damad İbrahim] en avait tentée auprès des Eaux-Douces d'Europe [Kâğıthane]:<sup>58</sup> This text transforms Damad İbrahim into a *francophile* Ottoman. In the process, Ahmed Refik turns the palace of Saadabad into an outright imitation of Versailles, as a physical attribute of its patron's ideological leanings.

In order to ensure that his readers would not think that such pro-European leanings had been limited to one outstanding vezir, Ahmed Refik stresses the Damad's close ties with the Sultan, so that the idea of *francophilia* is turned into the official Ottoman government stance during the 'Tulip Age'.<sup>59</sup> In *Fatma Sultan*, basing himself on personal letters, reports and autographs of the Sultan himself, the historian depicts Ahmed III's happy family life.<sup>60</sup> The main theme of the book nevertheless appears to be Damad İbrahim's beneficial and pro-Western policies. Ahmed Refik also presents Fatma Sultan as an outspoken patron and protector of the French cause. He even claims the Sultan to have been inclined towards favouring Frenchmen as well:

Fatma Sultan had a soft spot for the French. She never failed to favour the French during the *sadâret* of her husband İbrahim Paşa. In fact one day she said - I have a [great] affection for the French. I know very well that my father the sultan counts the French his dearest friends. In my heart I am extremely drawn to them.<sup>61</sup>

It is thus claimed that the Ottoman court had been under the sway of *francophile* sentiments during the early eighteenth century.

The historian then deals with the revolt which ended Ahmed III's reign. Ahmed Refik presents the event as having put an end to Damad İbrahim's enlightened rule that had been directing the Ottomans towards civilisation. This has to be understood as modern civilisation as practised in the contemporary West: '[a] vulgar person, Patrona Halil, stopped [short] the work of long years, [stopped short] the nation's progress towards prosperity and civilisation'.<sup>62</sup> In this little book then, ostensibly dealing with a daughter of Ahmed III, Ahmed Refik firmly delineates Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* so as to differentiate it from other periods in eighteenth-century Ottoman history. The Damad's term is depicted as a peaceful, tranquil and prosperous era, the likes of which were not to re-emerge in the Ottoman dominions: '[b]asically, peace and public safety did not reappear in the country: revolts kept on recurring, the people were never sure of their happiness'.<sup>63</sup> The implication seems to be that Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* represented a serious opportunity for respite for the Ottomans, which could have been employed to rearrange the state's affairs and introduce closer ties with Europe. This in turn would have been instrumental in modernising the outdated and exhausted Ottoman ways. Ahmed Refik seems to be suggesting in this short and dramatic piece that the social turmoil following the Patrona

Halil uprising did not allow for a second chance at rejuvenation in the eighteenth century.

### The Controversy with Fatma Aliye

The daily *İkdam* continued to publish a great many of Ahmed Refik's pieces dealing with the early eighteenth century. Early in 1917, for example, the daily carried a three-part series which details the establishment of an Ottoman printing press.<sup>64</sup> This series is yet another way of demonstrating Damad İbrahim's personal dedication to scientific progress, also listing the scholarly enterprises set up by the Grand Vezir.<sup>65</sup> He also uses the newspaper articles to highlight the role of Yirmisekiz Çelebi and Mehmed Said in the context of introducing European progress into the Ottoman Empire.<sup>66</sup> It is interesting to note that the article which appears next to Ahmed Refik's piece deals with the Russian revolution taking place at the time.<sup>67</sup> This could be seen as indicative of the way in which these pieces were thought to carry relevance at the time, in spite of ostensibly dealing with rather inappropriate issues. In 1333/1917 Ahmed Refik also published a set of 48 documents relating to Rakóczy's sojourn in the Ottoman lands under the auspices of the *TOE*, providing more background information on the events of the reign of Ahmed III.<sup>68</sup>

Following the publication of his *Lâle Devri* the historian Ahmed Refik seems to have been determined to champion the figures of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim. In the course of a dispute with the Ottoman writer Fatma Aliye, daughter of the renowned historian and politician Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, Ahmed Refik used his association with the daily *İkdam* to pronounce what would turn out to be a quasi-final verdict on Damad İbrahim as the originator of an Ottoman Empire oriented towards the Occident. On 17 November 1917 Fatma Aliye published an article entitled 'Şiir ve Kadın' in *İkdam*.<sup>69</sup> As a champion of women's rights in the Ottoman sphere Fatma Aliye had written this article to deal with the representation of women in Ottoman poetry.<sup>70</sup> Fatma Aliye had received a good education and was fluent in French. She wrote various novels as well as studies dealing with the position of women in Islam. Her most important contribution in this context is the work *Nisvân-i İslâm*, published in 1309/1891-92.<sup>71</sup> In the article 'Şiir ve Kadın' Fatma Aliye condemns various poets for their use of lascivious language and their encouragement of corrupt morals in their works. She also deals at length with Damad İbrahim Paşa:

It is a well-known fact that, while Damad İbrahim Paşa had concluded a peace treaty with the object in mind of reorganising and training the Ottoman soldiery, he, although he was in complete charge of the sadâret for

more than twelve years, far from re-establishing order amongst the soldiers, succeeded in upsetting the order [of the land] . . . In the flower age of Damad İbrahim Paşa, the inventor of street flirtations, women were regarded as flowers and pretty babies. Such a state of affairs dealt a great blow to our social manners! This inventive figure, who made lamps from tortoises, effected a revolution in our social life . . . Together with his sycophantic [friends] he used to go to Kâğıthane to engage in hazelnut throwing contests! He complimented those able to throw a hazelnut into the veils of women sitting in their carriages.<sup>72</sup>

Fatma Aliye reinforces her father's negative verdict on Damad İbrahim. In his *Tarih*, Cevdet Paşa expressed the opinion that Damad İbrahim's tenure as Grand Vezir had been a missed opportunity to reform the Ottoman armed forces. Cevdet had been quite harsh in his condemnation of the Damad's propensity to indulge in *zevk ü sefâ*.<sup>73</sup> Fatma Aliye takes this verdict a step further. She equally declares Damad İbrahim's inability to restore the Ottoman armed forces, in the process indicating that she also regards Ottoman chances of renewal and survival as dependent upon reform of the military establishment.<sup>74</sup>

Fatma Aliye seems to show an awareness of Ahmed Refik's work, calling Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* a 'Flower Age' ('çiçek devri'),<sup>75</sup> but continues that the Grand Vezir had been nothing but the 'inventor' of 'street flirtations'. For Fatma Aliye, Damad İbrahim had been careless about safeguarding the honour and moral rectitude of women as required by Islam. The article 'Şiir ve Kadın' states that his 12-year tenure as Grand Vezir had in fact seen the emergence of a permissive society based on the public abuse of women. In her view, İbrahim's tenure had ushered in a moral decline that denigrated women. Fatma Aliye ironically calls Damad İbrahim a 'social reformer'. But, she explains, the extent of his 'reforms' had been limited to throwing hazelnuts under unsuspecting women's veils. Ahmed Refik recounts a similar anecdote in his *Lâle Devri*, but states that the Damad had indulged in throwing small gold coins or *zer-i mahbûbs* into women's *yaşmaks* or veils.<sup>76</sup> He places this anecdote in the context of İbrahim Paşa's attempts to limit wasteful expenditure on garments, by way of an interesting contrast between İbrahim Paşa's personal behaviour and public persona.

### Fındıklılı Şemdanîzâde Efendi

In a three-part reply appearing about a fortnight after Fatma Aliye's article, Ahmed Refik states that Damad İbrahim's reputation had been primarily slan-

dered by the chronicler Fındıklılı Şemdanîzâde Süleyman Efendi. And he claims that subsequent historians and writers had simply copied Şemdanîzâde's biased accounts, in this way casting severe aspersions on Cevdet Paşa's standing as a serious historian.<sup>77</sup> In the late eighteenth-century, Şemdanîzâde Süleyman composed a historical narrative entitled *Mür'î't-Tevarih*, which indeed contains an acerbic description of Damad İbrahim's ill-fated policies and personal pursuits<sup>78</sup>

Şemdanîzâde had never been appointed *vakanüvis*, but composed his book as a *zeyl* to Kâtib Çelebi's *Takvimü't-Tevarih*, which recounts human history from the creation of Adam till the year 1058/1648. Kâtib Çelebi's book was printed by Müteferrika in 1146/1733.<sup>79</sup> Şemdanîzâde indicates in his narrative that it had taken him 13 years to compose the work (1761-74), and that he had consulted 400 individual books. Şemdanîzâde Süleyman Efendi presented his opus to Sultan Abdülhamid I (1774-89) in 1188/1774.<sup>80</sup> But the manuscript was never printed in the original, and thus remained a little known source until the twentieth century, when the manuscript was first edited and published by Ahmed Tevhid in 1338/1922 and later in transliterated form by Münir Aktepe in 1976.<sup>81</sup>

I will take a closer look at Münir Aktepe's edition to determine the nature of Ahmed Refik's criticism of Cevdet. In dealing with the events of the year '1143 (1730-1731)' Süleyman Efendi's text relates the events on the eastern front, and the government's lack of a coordinated response to the dangers posed by Nadir Shah.<sup>82</sup> Leaving the military narrative aside, the sub-heading '*Müsaade-i fiskdan zarar*' ('Harm Resulting From Permitting Vice') leaves no doubt about the fact that Damad İbrahim possessed an untrustworthy character, and was even continually, 'night and day', engaged in devising new ways of procuring pleasure.<sup>83</sup> But not just content with occupying himself and his coterie in this fashion, the Damad also wanted to involve the population to keep them occupied and docile. For this reason the Grand Vezir had entertainment centres, called *harmanlıks*, set up across the wider city of İstanbul during the feast to celebrate the end of the month of fasting, *ramazan*, from the Hippodrome and Bâyezid square in the old city, through the area north of the Golden Horn ('Kasım Paşa'). Even the sacred area of Eyüp received a *harmanlık*, as well as the coastline of the Bosphorus ('Tobhâne . . . Dolmabağçe ve Bebek'), in addition to certain districts on the Anatolian shoreline ('Göksu . . . ve Beykoz ve Üsküdar').<sup>84</sup> These *harmanlıks* contained a variety of attractions, most notably merry-go-rounds and swings.

Şemdanîzâde is particularly critical of these swings. They were used by men and women alike. He indicates that attractive young men helped the women get on and off these swings. On which the women got so carried away, they allowed views up their skirts. All the while they were singing in fine voices, an action

that one could reason was particularly unbefitting proper Muslim housewives and mothers. The manuscript then mentions that women, being prone to deficient ways of reasoning, attended these entertainments with or without the permission of their husbands.<sup>85</sup>

This last statement leads Şemdânîzâde to indicate that women had become so addicted to these entertainments that, if husbands did not grant permission to attend, women would simply demand a divorce, leading to a rise in single [divorced] women.<sup>86</sup> He goes on to say that this immoral state of affairs led to a proliferation of loose women, even saying that not even five honourable women were left in each neighbourhood.<sup>87</sup> This leads the outraged chronicler to state that Damad İbrahim himself engaged in throwing small gold coins into women's veils, causing them to blush in embarrassment.<sup>88</sup> This catalogue of Damad İbrahim's moral outrages leads Şemdânîzâde to dwell upon the 'tulip hype'. This craze enveloped the city at the time, and was actively encouraged by the Grand Vezir, he adds. Quite naturally he talks about the Damad's wasteful entertainments in the same breath: 'lâle çırağanları' and 'helvâ sohbetleri'.<sup>89</sup> Şemdânîzâde Süleyman Efendi goes on to deal with the reasons behind this sudden flowering of hedonistic pastimes in İstanbul. The wars with the Habsburgs had earlier led to serious losses, yet the Damad sued for peace:

. . . and while the German peace was being negotiated, the ulema and members of the state declared that peace was not appropriate as Timişoara and Belgrade remained in the hands of the unbelievers, while the discipline of the soldiery had been lost [as well], [Damad İbrahim] said, let us act according to the requirements of the day [and] conclude peace to reinstate order to the soldiery as required to then exact revenge. After that, let alone restoring the order of the soldiery, he initiated new-fangled ceremonies and games so that the remaining order [of society] was even disrupted<sup>90</sup>

In the late eighteenth century Süleyman Efendi was thus the first to assert that Damad İbrahim had concluded a peace agreement upon the understanding that he would subsequently initiate a policy that would have allowed the Ottoman soldiery to avenge their losses.

In talking about the wars in İnan, Şemdânîzâde Süleyman Efendi refers to the enemy as 'Kızılbaş' (Shi'ite), in spite of the fact that Nadir Shah was a *sünnî* tribal leader in the employ of Shah-Sultan Husayn's son Tahmasp. He claims that these forces attacked and defeated Ottoman positions, imprisoning 'Muslim' [*sünnî*] women and children.<sup>91</sup> While these disasters were happening in the east, the Grand Vezir developed the area of Kâğıthane and authorised the pursuit of vice and sin.<sup>92</sup> In the same breath Şemdânîzâde also hints at the Damad's

nepotism.<sup>93</sup> These complaints about the Grand Vezir lead the chronicler to talk about the *kadı* of İstanbul, Zülâlî Hasan Efendi, in the process providing a better insight into his role in the rebellion. Şemdânîzâde declares that Zülâlî noticed the negative turn that Ottoman affairs were taking at the time as well as the population's growing dislike of Damad İbrahim Paşa, leading the *Kadı* to pronounce that this Grand Vezir and his coterie would cause the disintegration of the state.<sup>94</sup> Upon hearing of these indiscreet comments, Damad İbrahim had the *Kadı* banished to his farm in Çekmece, to put a halt to such incendiary talk as well as to teach Zülâlî Hasan a lesson.<sup>95</sup> Here Şemdânîzâde gives a different slant to the official version of the *Kadı*'s dismissal. The *Tarih-i Çelebizâde Efendi* states that the *Kadı* Zülâlî Hasan Efendi had failed to furnish İstanbul's population with sufficient foodstuffs, and had been equally unable to provide adequate security to various parts of the city.<sup>96</sup> Following his removal from the post, the former *vakanüvis* Râşid Mehmed Efendi, Çelebizâde's predecessor, was promoted to the *kadılık*.<sup>97</sup> Zülâlî's income had been redirected to his successor Râşid, possibly leaving Zülâlî Hasan and his family without means to support themselves.

Rather than describing Zülâlî as incompetent and motivated by greed, Şemdânîzâde portrays him as a political dissident, who tried to uphold the moral integrity of the state's rulers and ruled alike. The *Mür'î't-Tevarih* then relates that Zülâlî Hasan, as an Albanian, contacted his compatriots Patrona Halil, affiliated with the seventeenth *cemaat* [regiment] of the Janissaries and a member of the crew of the galleon 'Patorona', and the *müderris* Deli İbrahim. The three men then held a meeting to organise a rebellion.<sup>98</sup> After having decided on a plan of action they set out to realise their scheme, which Şemdânîzâde quite naturally calls an 'unjust enterprise'.<sup>99</sup> On 5 Rebiyülevvel/18 September, Patrona and sixteen henchmen started a rising on the Bâyezid Square, from where they proceeded through the markets to move to the 'Meydân-ı Lâhm' [*Et Meydanı*], where they secured the compliance of various *bölüks* [division] of Janissaries. Şemdânîzâde details the whole event, mentioning the government's attempt to gather support for the Sultan's cause using the *Sancağ-ı Şerif* [the Prophet's Banner], and eventually relating the story of the meeting of the *ulema* in the precincts of the Palace.<sup>100</sup>

Şemdânîzâde Süleyman is firm in condemning the *ulema* for their compliance and does not shy away from directly accusing the *Şeyhülislâm* Yenişehirli Abdullah.<sup>101</sup> The historian reports Abdullah Efendi's speech as follows:

he said, the intention of the rebels . . . is well-known, as they desire a sultan better able to act properly futile exertions are pointless; let the morning come [and] let us find peace by [forcing] the Sultan to abdicate.<sup>102</sup>

Whereas Hammer, basing himself on the *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî*, merely indicates that the *Şeyhülislâm* had been resigned to complying with the wishes of the rebels if necessary,<sup>103</sup> Şemdanîzâde here actually insinuates that Abdullah Efendi had proposed to actively depose Ahmed III so as to regain peace of mind.

The *Mür'it-Tevarih* provides a harsh picture of the *Şeyhülislâm* as a mercenary individual. Yenişehirli Abdullah had in time risen to his position due to the Grand Vezir's patronage after having been dismissed from his *ulema* post in Bursa.<sup>104</sup> The *Sadr-ı Azam* and the *Şeyhülislâm* had both enjoyed their respective tenures for a duration of 12/3 years,<sup>105</sup> yet the latter did not hesitate to depose the Sultan to secure personal advantage. The historian indicates that this 'senseless' act had led to the deposition of the Sultan.<sup>106</sup> Şemdanîzâde Süleyman Efendi then brings the narrative of the sybaritic Damad İbrahim to its conclusion. He simply relates the rather swift way in which the Grand Vezir and three of his coterie were executed.<sup>107</sup> And subsequently, on 19 Rebiyülahir 1143/1 November 1730<sup>108</sup> Ahmed III abdicated in favour of his nephew Mahmud I, after having received assurances regarding his own safety and that of his children.<sup>109</sup>

Münir Aktepe declares that Şemdanîzâde Süleyman had used the works of the *vakânüvis* Mehmed Subhî and Süleyman İzzi.<sup>110</sup> The former's narrative relates to the period 1149-55/1736-42, whereas the latter covers the years 1157-65/1744-52.<sup>111</sup> In view of the fact that Süleyman Efendi gives a lot of detail regarding the Patrona Halil rebellion, it is likely he also consulted the manuscript version of the work of Mustafa Sâmî Efendi, whose contribution to the printed *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî* relates to the period 1143-44/1730-31, starting with a full account of the accession of Sultan Mahmud I.<sup>112</sup>

In turn, in the nineteenth century Ahmed Cevdet and Mustafa Nuri consulted Şemdanîzâde's *Mür'it-Tevarih*, as their wording on occasion resembles Şemdanîzâde's accusations. A telling example is the recurrence of the phrase 'nevîcâd âyin ve oyunlar' ('new-fangled ceremonies and games') in the *Tarih-i Cevdet*.<sup>113</sup> Ahmed Cevdet also seems to have based his contention that Damad İbrahim had actively upset the balance of the Ottoman system on the *Mür'it-Tevarih*. Şemdanîzâde's phrase 'askere nizâm vermek şöyle dursun bâki kalan nizâmı dahi bozub' ('let alone restoring the order of the soldiery the remaining order [of society] was even disrupted'), resembles the wording used by Cevdet as well ('askere nizâm vermek şöyle dursun devletin eski usûl ve nizâmını bile muhtel etdi').<sup>114</sup> As a result, it would seem that Ahmed Refik's accusation that Cevdet had based his account on Şemdanîzâde is correct. Ahmed Cevdet himself indicates in the 1309/1891-2 edition of his *Tarih* that he had used the *Mür'it-Tevarih*. He expresses his appreciation of Şemdanîzâde Süleyman as a 'non-official chronicler' of Ottoman history, who had 'written in a frank language'.<sup>115</sup>



As can be deduced from the wording of Fatma Aliye's 'Şiir ve Kadın', she must have also had access to the *Mür'it-Tevarih*. Şemdanîzâde's mention of the Damad's habit of throwing little gold coins into women's veils, using the expression 'findık altını' ('hazelnut gold'), seems to have led her to describe İbrahim Paşa's invention of so-called 'hazelnut contests' ('findık endâhtı'). Mustafa Nuri and Ahmed Refik also seem to have consulted Şemdanîzâde's manuscript in view of their recounting of the same anecdotal account.<sup>116</sup> Nuri mentions the story as providing proof of İbrahim Paşa's debauched personality. By contrast, Ahmed Refik, in his *Lâle Devri*, uses the account to illustrate the fact that Damad İbrahim's personal life contrasted with his public persona which showed the Vezir as a duty-bound individual who attempted to curb female extravagance and moral decline. In the process of recounting the anecdote, Ahmed Refik inserts the name *zer-i mabbûb* referring to a certain type of gold coin into his narrative,<sup>117</sup> thus avoiding the eighteenth-century expression 'findık altını'.

Ahmed Refik's claim regarding the rise in divorces during the 'Tulip Age' also seems to have been based on Şemdanîzâde's manuscript. But his utilisation of the mention that more and more women demanded divorces during Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* is used to highlight the fact that women had supposedly become too self-indulgent and materialistic at the time. In other words, his personal misgivings of the proclivities of women as well as a certain misogynist bias seem to have determined Ahmed Refik's interpretation of the breakdown of matrimony in the 'Tulip Age'.<sup>118</sup> Ahmed Cevdet, in contrast, replicates Şemdanîzâde's account that the Grand Vezir's encouragement of hedonistic pastimes was to be blamed for the breakdown of public morality during İbrahim's *sadâret*.<sup>119</sup> It is interesting to note how the two historians used the same source to bolster very different arguments in their respective narratives — a nice illustration of the fact that history is first and foremost a product of its writing.

### The 'Tulip Age' as a Precursor of the *Tanzimat*

In spite of the real links between Ahmed Cevdet's text and Şemdanîzâde's *Mür'it-Tevarih*, Fatma Aliye nevertheless rather understandably felt the need to defend her father's reputation against Ahmed Refik's slanders and published a two-part article dealing with the issue of Damad İbrahim Paşa.<sup>120</sup> She defends her father's methodological integrity and proceeds to explain her views on Damad İbrahim as a Grand Vezir who had squandered large sums of money on sumptuous entertainments. Ahmed Refik's response was a six-part exposition of Damad İbrahim's posthumous reputation published in December 1917.<sup>121</sup> In the first instalment he reiterates his contention that the writer Şemdanîzâde

should carry the blame for blackening Damad İbrahim's reputation.<sup>122</sup> He subsequently claims that Ahmed Cevdet and Mustafa Nuri had simply duplicated Şemdanzâde's prejudiced account. Ahmed Refik is particularly critical of Cevdet Paşa as the most outspoken opponent of Damad İbrahim:

In our opinion no other work has yet been written in Turkish that is in opposition to İbrahim Paşa to the degree displayed in the *Tarih-i Cevdet* and [also] denies his numerous virtues.<sup>123</sup>

The *Tarih-i Cevdet* is presented as a text containing propagandistic passages and *ad hominem* attacks. Leaving the historiographical criticism aside, Ahmed Refik makes a remarkable statement in the third part of the series:

It is our claim that in our history İbrahim Paşa is one of the harbingers of the Tanzimat. Contact with European civilisation commenced in his time. The ambition of applying this civilisation [to our own] became apparent during his term of office.<sup>124</sup>

The heated debate induced Ahmed Refik to make a programmatic statement concerning his protagonist, Damad İbrahim. One could say that he throws all caution to the wind in proclaiming Damad İbrahim Paşa to have been a 'harbinger of the *Tanzimat*' or 'Tanzimâtın mübeşşirlerindendir'. The statement betrays the historian's Ottomanist credentials, as an apparent supporter of the beneficial effects of the proclamation *Gülhâne Hatt-ı Hümayını* on 3 November 1839 leading to the promulgation of the *Tanzimat* (1839-76) reforms.<sup>125</sup> In view of Europe's advances and gains on the world stage, its civilisation had become the benchmark of modernity, supposedly containing the solution to the Ottomans' problems. Attempts at applying this civilisational mode in an Ottoman context denoted the beginning of the modernisation of the world of Islam. Contemporary Ottomanists regarded the *Tanzimat* as a first step towards modernising the outdated Ottoman system through the establishment of European structures in 'Turkey'. The chairman of the *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni*, Abdurrahman Şeref, for example, developed such notions in his column 'Musahabe-i Tarihiyye' (Historical Talks) appearing in the newspaper *Sabah*. These pieces were published at the same time as Ahmed Refik's above-quoted programmatic statement, during the latter part of 1917.<sup>126</sup>

The dispute with Fatma Aliye encouraged Ahmed Refik to pronounce a definite and distinctly Ottomanist verdict on the activities of Damad İbrahim Paşa.<sup>127</sup> He concluded that the 'Tulip Age' had constituted an early precursor of the modernising reforms initiated during the *Tanzimat*. The dispute between Ahmed Refik and Fatma Aliye continued, but their positions had ossi-

fied and the argument ended in rather personal attacks by the historian on Cevdet Paşa and his daughter.<sup>128</sup> In the end this quarrel forced Ahmed Refik to declare his commitment to Damad İbrahim as an early precursor of the Ottoman officials who had propagated the *Tanzimat*, such as Reşid and Âli and Fuâd Paşas.<sup>129</sup> Ahmed Refik was compelled to disclose his teleological approach to Damad İbrahim and Ahmed III. His enthusiasm for the splendour and brilliance displayed in the feasts, palaces, fountains and habits of the ‘Tulip Age’ is apparent in his writings dealing with the period. Even though the original text of *Lâle Devri* itself does not contain an explicit reference to the nineteenth-century reform movement, one could posit that on a sub-textual level the imagery of *zevk ü sefâ* was but a ploy to lure newspaper readers into considering Damad İbrahim as a figure worthy of their interest. Once established, this interest awakened a lively concern with the ‘Tulip Age’ as an era supposedly witnessing similar problems to those faced by the *Tanzimat* and the second *Meşrutiyet*. Hence, Ahmed Refik showed himself to have been an enthusiastic Ottomanist supporter in 1917/1332. As if to prove his Ottomanist credentials, the historian even published an overt propaganda booklet that carried a distinct Ottomanist and Islamist message, *Padişahlarımızda Din Gayreti ve Vatan Muhabbeti*, ascribing patriotic feelings and religious zeal to the Ottoman sultans as a way of exhorting Ottoman soldiers into battle.<sup>130</sup>

Ahmed Refik’s propaganda publications illustrate the evolution of the Ottomanist ideology in the late Ottoman Empire. The Ottomanist position, as an inheritance from the nineteenth-century *Tanzimat*, at first propagated the notion of a common Ottoman citizenship for all inhabitants, irrespective of their ethnic or religious backgrounds. Ahmed Refik’s earlier-quoted *Osmanlı Taribine Dâir Nefer Ne Bilmelidir* (1328/1912) advocated this secular, all-inclusive form of Ottomanist solidarity, presenting the Ottoman sultans as symbolic properties of all Ottoman soldiers, Muslims and Christians alike. Following the Balkan War and the Treaty of London (10 June 1913), the Ottomans lost nearly all of their European possessions to newly independent Christian states on the peninsula. Not only did the Balkan Wars rouse global Muslim public opinion to the side of the ‘Sultan of Turkey’, at the same time the Ottoman authorities felt that only the Islamic component of the Empire was inspired to support the cause of the Ottoman sultan and nation. As a result, Ottomanism as a state ideology became more Islamic in its character, to the exclusion of the non-Muslim inhabitants of the Sultan’s dominions.<sup>131</sup> Ahmed Refik’s *Padişahlarımızda Din Gayreti* clearly underscores this development. The general consensus among scholars, however, is to assume that following the advent of the so-called Young Turk regime the ideological position of Turanism, Turkism or Turkish nationalism became predominant in the Ottoman dominions. Even though, this interpretive stance should be approached with

caution, the ideology of Turkism was nevertheless a reality which exerted a certain influence on numerous Ottoman intellectuals at the time.

### The 'Tulip Age' as a 'Renaissance in Turkey'

In the further course of 1917/1333, a definite Turkist element also entered Ahmed Refik's writings. The historian even felt the need to underline the fact that Damad İbrahim had been a Muslim Turk who had undertaken a 'very civilised role in Ottoman history'.<sup>132</sup> The newspaper *İkdam*'s editorial staff regarded this announcement as worthy of front-page news in these days of war and turmoil (5 December 1917). The avowedly Turkist periodical *Yeni Mecmua*, founded in July 1917/1333,<sup>133</sup> proved a ready forum for his views.<sup>134</sup> Ahmed Refik used these contributions to strengthen some of his earlier claims, which he had to recalibrate to conform to the outspoken Turkist line taken by Ziya Gökalp and the *Yeni Mecmua*. In January 1918, for example, he has a piece on Sultan Ahmed's fountain or *çeşme* in front of the *Bâb-ı Hümayûn* published.<sup>135</sup> He apparently regards the majority of the square-fountains to have been devised by Ahmed III himself. Ahmed Refik's claim is that all these fountains were built shortly after the year '(1141)' or 1728-29.<sup>136</sup> According to the architectural historian Godfrey Goodwin, however, these fountains had actually been built 'between 1728 and 1732'.<sup>137</sup> This means of course that some of them were constructed after Ahmed III's death. These attractive square fountains that first appeared during Ahmed III's reign provide Ahmed Refik with the opportunity to reiterate some of his earlier claims regarding the architectural activity during Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*. For example, he states unequivocally that 'Saadabad was the most important building constructed' at the time.<sup>138</sup>

In an article dealing with the relationship between Ahmed III and his son-in-law [Damad İbrahim], Ahmed Refik again asserts the human character of the Sultan, as a simple family man.<sup>139</sup> But, he does not fail to point out that Sultan Ahmed had been a greedy individual.<sup>140</sup> In the end, he emphasises the close, personal ties between the Sultan and his Grand Vizir.<sup>141</sup> On the anniversary of the negotiations of the Treaty of Passarowitz he published an article hinting at the similarity of the military problems facing the Ottomans then and in his own day.<sup>142</sup> At the outset of the piece the historian remarks how, in the eighteenth century, the palace in Edirne, where the court resided during wartime, had been divided into proponents of a continuation of war and a more peace-loving camp.<sup>143</sup> The parallelism with the contemporary situation could not have escaped anyone's attention at the time. On the eve of the Great War (1914-18)<sup>144</sup> the government was divided between a warlike faction led by Enver Paşa, favouring closer ties with the Germans, and a more conciliatory party led by

Ahmed Cemal Paşa, leaning more towards the *Triple Entente*, 'or even better, neutrality'.<sup>145</sup> At a time when the war effort seemed to lead only to disasters, the earlier antagonism between Enver and Cemal Paşas could have caused a number of Ottomans to reconsider the Empire's enthusiastic entry into the Great War, thus making Ahmed Refik's article a timely reminder.

Not just content with pointing out the recurrence of historical situations, Ahmed Refik also employed his association with *Yeni Mecmua* to posit new claims regarding Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim. In April 1918, for example, he published an article, entitled 'İstanbulda Ecnebi Ressamlar', dealing with the presence of European artists in İstanbul, a piece that contains a rather contentious stance.<sup>146</sup> Ahmed Refik undoubtedly relied heavily on Auguste Boppe's *Les peintres du Bosphore* to provide him with factual information.<sup>147</sup> But this material was only used as a backdrop to highlight his own claims. At the outset of the article he announces in a facile manner that the second half of Ahmed III's reign witnessed the emergence of a kind of 'renaissance in Turkey'.<sup>148</sup> He explains this claim by referring to the refined artistic, literary and architectural scene in France during the *régence* (1715-23). This then leads him to posit Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi as the intermediary who communicated this artistic and cultural flowering so that its effects could be manifested in İstanbul.<sup>149</sup> In this instance Ahmed Refik assigns a major role to Ottoman ambassador who had visited Louis XV in Paris. In his *Lâle Devri* (1913/1328-29) he was rather sparse in dealing with the Ottoman ambassador.<sup>150</sup> Here, however, he emphasises Mehmed Çelebi's function in Damad İbrahim's scheme to discover the intricacies of the European political system, arguably basing himself on his own piece in *Tarihî Simâlar* (1914/1330).<sup>151</sup> Furthermore he refers to the mission's connection with the restoration of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.<sup>152</sup> Finally he avows that Mehmed Çelebi's son, Said Efendi, had been instrumental in setting up an Ottoman [Muslim] printing press. He earlier mentioned these claims in his collection *Tarihî Simâlar* as well.

The article 'İstanbulda Ecnebi Ressamlar', published in April 1918, however, renders Yirmisekiz Çelebi the primary transmitter of a French aesthetic to İstanbul's summer palaces and tulip gardens. But then Ahmed Refik does not really follow up this assertion with a thorough explanation of his usage of the term 'rönesans', instead he rather simply assumes traits of European influence to be indicative of renewal and progress. He claims that at the time, the 12<sup>th</sup> century AH [1688-1785], Europe ('Lâtin beldesi') and the Ottoman Empire ('Bizans') had been in mutual contact and exchange in as far as their dedication to pleasurable pursuits was concerned.<sup>153</sup> His sentence juxtaposes the words 'Lâtin' and 'Bizans' as if to indicate a high affinity between the West and the Ottomans at the time.<sup>154</sup> As a result, the article 'İstanbulda Ecnebi Ressamlar' reduces the interaction between the West and the Ottomans to artistic affairs

and pleasurable pursuits. But at a further stage in the piece, Ahmed Refik again puts forward Damad İbrahim as the propagator of this novel attitude.<sup>155</sup> He positions the Grand Vezir at the centre of this transformation, claiming that İbrahim Paşa himself had wanted to encourage a heightened 'artistic awareness', and a 'love for scholarship and learning' ("maarif") in the Ottoman lands.<sup>156</sup> And, he refers anew to Saadabad as a 'sample' of a French aesthetic.<sup>157</sup>

These programmatic announcements are followed by Ahmed Refik's exposition of the actual subject-matter of the article: the painters Jean-Baptiste Vanmour, present in İstanbul during Ahmed III's reign (1703-30) and Jean-Baptiste Hilaire, in turn active in İstanbul during Abdülhamid I's reign (1774-89). Ahmed Refik describes the various pictures produced by these artists of daily life in the Ottoman Empire, and ends his article with the assertion that it would be necessary to possess copies of these works in 'Turkish libraries' as they represent documents of the history of 'Turkish life'. His claim is that it is essential to strengthen the awareness of the traditions and historical presence of the Turks to awaken greater patriotism and nationalism in the country.<sup>158</sup>

### *Tanzimat versus Renaissance*

The article 'İstanbulda Ecnebî Ressamlar' subscribes to the nationalist agenda prevalent at the time and propagated by the *Yeni Mecmua*. The interesting aspect of this piece, however, is Ahmed Refik's willingness to qualify further the 'Tulip Age'. But he speaks only of the second half of Ahmed III's reign, which corresponds to the time-frame of the *Lâle Devri* as defined in his own book. As explained above, on 17 December 1917 the historian disclosed his contention that the 'Tulip Age' had constituted an early precursor of the *Tanzimat*, but four months later he goes a stage further in the nationalist *Yeni Mecmua*. In the preamble of the article he calls the era a 'renaissance in Turkey' (18 April 1918). The piece tries to illustrate the long-standing links between 'Turkey' and 'Europe'. Turkish nationalism, as articulated by Ziya Gökalp, hinges on the modernisation of 'Turkey' for the achievement of its goals and aspirations.<sup>159</sup>

In his seminal 'Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak', published in 1913, Ziya Gökalp describes the existence of three separate ideological movements in the Ottoman lands.<sup>160</sup> Gökalp considers '(muasırlaşmak *modernisation*)' to have been universally praised and clamoured for by the contemporary press. Islamism and Turkism, on the other hand, were promoted by the periodicals *Sınat-ı Müstakim*, *Sebilü'r-Reşad* and *Türk Yurdu* respectively, he states. Employing the Turkist platform of *Türk Yurdu*, Ziya Gökalp sets out to present his interpretative approach to Ottoman history. At this early stage (1329/1913) he was already totally convinced of the primacy of the Turkish element in the Ottoman system.<sup>161</sup> The Ottoman Empire as a composite entity, containing

various different ethnic as well as religious components, leads Gökalp to classify the Ottoman state as '(vâki bir millet *nation de fait*)'. He calls the Ottoman enterprise a *de facto* nation, rather than a proponent of a true nationalist ideal. Such an ideal, in his view, could only lead to '(irâdî bir millet *nation de volonté*)' or a voluntary unit. Gökalp's contention is that the element of volition plays a part in the development of nationalist feelings in the sense that a common cultural and linguistic heritage necessarily gives rise to feelings of common allegiance based on individuals' wish to take part in such a nationalist body.<sup>162</sup> Ziya Gökalp was committed to the Ottoman-Islamic cause, but as a Turkist sympathiser he rather easily equates the notion of an Ottoman state with the goals of Turkism. As a result he is vehemently opposed to the principle of Ottomanism, which he recognises as an outcome of the promulgation of the *Tanzimat*:

At the time when those who were beholden to the movement of becoming concurrent with the contemporary state of affairs [modernisation] were spreading the ideas of the *Tanzimat*, they were convinced that it was possible to transform a *de facto* nation consisting of various elements and religious convictions into a voluntary nation . . .<sup>163</sup>

Such an exercise of social engineering could only lead to Gökalp's extreme disapproval. The enterprise of setting up an 'artificial' Ottoman nation, with a common language and history, was nothing but a lie and a misleading ruse, he explains:

The followers of the *Tanzimat* wanted to draw a deceptive veil over the face of Turkism. There existed no national Turkish language, but instead there existed an Ottoman [language] common to all [ethnic] elements. All the elements coalesced . . . a historical race, an Ottoman nation had come into being. Just as this nation possessed a special language, it also possessed a history that was particular to it.<sup>164</sup>

Ziya Gökalp does not hide his contempt for these aims of the *Tanzimat*. And in his view none of the inhabitants of the Ottoman dominions gave credence to this political exercise.<sup>165</sup> In his view only the Turkish element of the Ottoman enterprise had been led astray by the *Tanzimat's* deception.<sup>166</sup>

In line with this way of thinking, Ahmed Refik was forced to employ a new term to indicate Ahmed III's, or rather Damad İbrahim Paşa's, progressive leanings. In December 1917 he established the link between the 'Tulip Age' and the *Tanzimat*, in line with his personal Ottomanist proclivities. But writing in the nationalist publication *Yeni Mecmua* he did not use such a characterisation of Damad İbrahim's term of office to describe a growing interaction with the West.

In the sixteenth century the 'Renaissance' had supposedly renewed European culture and civilisation by providing a connection with ancient Greece and Rome, and similarly Ahmed Refik claims that the eighteenth century had witnessed an analogous development in Turkish culture and civilisation through a lively interaction with the West. In *Lâle Devri* the term 'intibâh' or 'awakening' is employed on numerous occasions to indicate Damad İbrahim's beneficial influences on Ottoman life through a link-up with contemporary Europe.<sup>167</sup> In the same text though, he also employs the same Ottoman term ('intibâh') to refer to the European 'Renaissance'.<sup>168</sup> As a result, now writing in a nationalist periodical, the historian simply conflates these two separate meanings so as to arrive at the claim that Damad İbrahim had supervised a 'renaissance in Turkey', thus avoiding mention of the word "Tanzimat".

The term 'Renaissance' itself had been launched in 1860, when Jacob Burckhard first published his *Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*.<sup>169</sup> In this work Burckhardt picked up on the term *rinascità*, used by Giorgio Vasari to describe the artistic atmosphere of his own era in his famous *Vite* (1550). The critic August Buck says that Burckhardt regarded the '*renaissance*' as the 'cradle of the modern'. He claims that the term '*renaissance*', with all of its ramifications, only became firmly established from the 1880s onwards.<sup>170</sup> Luca Farulli declares the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche to be held chiefly responsible for the creation of the 'myth' of the '*renaissance*' as the era that witnessed the emergence of a human will, free of religious constraint. Nietzsche viewed the '*renaissance*' as a particularly anti-clerical period in stark contrast with the previous ultra-religious Middle Ages and the subsequent era of the reformation which reaffirmed the Church's primacy in European life.<sup>171</sup> One could posit that Ahmed Refik's association with a nationalist group led to the creation of a new interpretation of Damad İbrahim's tenure as Grand Vezir, an interpretation that was to be very influential in years to come. His professional relationship with Ziya Gökalp and his followers induced Ahmed Refik to declare that Damad İbrahim had been at the forefront of a cultural revival movement in early eighteenth-century 'Turkey'.

### The End of the Ottoman Empire

The Armistice of Mudros (30 October 1918), which marked the end of the Great War's eastern flank, brought about the effective dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. Still, on 30 December 1919, İstanbul's population rejoiced in the 671th anniversary of the Ottoman State by means of processions and public celebrations.<sup>172</sup> A month prior to that delusory commemoration, Ahmed Refik published a series in *İkdam* tackling the issue of the *medrese* and *ulema* head-on.<sup>173</sup> In this series Ahmed Refik sets out to provide a historical back-



ground to the dominance of the *ulema* in Ottoman affairs and public life, and to delineate the way in which they had impeded 'Turkish' progress. One could argue that in the face of defeat the historian composed this series in an attempt to rationalise the current Ottoman predicament. In his *Lâle Devri* (1913/1328-29), Ahmed Refik singles out the reign of Sultan Mehmed III (1595-1603) as having witnessed the beginning of Ottoman decline. In 1919, however, Ahmed Refik identifies Mehmed's father Murad III (1574-95) as having overseen the onset of decay and decadence. The historian posits that members of the *ulema* began to dominate the palace in Sultan Murad's day.<sup>174</sup> This rather neutral statement is followed by the pronouncement that Murad III's reign saw the corruption of every form of state organisation, including the *ilmiyye*.<sup>175</sup> It is contended that subsequently, throughout the seventeenth century, the *ulema's* preoccupation with material concerns led to the establishment of a bigoted interpretation of Islam throughout the Empire, a development which achieved its zenith during the reign of Mehmed IV (1648-87), Ahmed III's father.<sup>176</sup> Following this historical exposition, Ahmed Refik proceeds to deal with the era of Ahmed III directly.

At the outset he claims that throughout the previous period members of the *ulema* cooperated with reactionary movements as a means of safeguarding their personal interests and advantages.<sup>177</sup> But, he continues, from the accession of Ahmed III onwards, they employed a new means to justify their compliance with open revolt and reaction: 'an assault on the civilisation of the West'.<sup>178</sup> Ahmed Refik portrays the *ulema* as particularly hostile to Western civilisation. He claims that in Ahmed III's reign closer ties were forged with the West, which had been unheard of in the previous century when the Ottoman population had been unaware of Western culture and civilisation.<sup>179</sup> But now, the historian affirms, the Sultan's government was in close contact with European ambassadors, giving rise to a growing willingness to adopt scientific and cultural, as well as political innovations from the West.<sup>180</sup> Ahmed Refik also indicates that Ahmed III had wanted to reform the *ulema* class, leading to severe action authorised by Damad İbrahim.<sup>181</sup>

The historian acknowledges the fact that a great many worthy scholars were active at the time, but avows that their mentality had been backward and 'fundamentalist' (that is possessing a '*Kadıvzade* mentality').<sup>182</sup> It is interesting to note that Ahmed Refik employs a reference to the 'revivalist' seventeenth-century *Kadıvzadeli* movement to describe the inherently retrogressive nature of the *ilmiyye's* members in Ahmed III's day.<sup>183</sup> The topical nature of this series is disclosed by his statement that this mentality could only have been remedied by means of teaching Western culture and positive sciences.<sup>184</sup> The idea that the *ulema* could be reformed through including scientific courses in their training was a clear allusion to the issue of *medrese* reorganisation.<sup>185</sup> Ahmed Refik de-

clares the huge progress made in the past two centuries by indicating that the application of such a novel curriculum would have been impossible in the early eighteenth century.

Ahmed Refik employs these pieces on the influence of the *ulema* to further fine-tune his appraisal of Damad İbrahim and the 'Tulip Age'. He portrays the opposition of the *ulema* to the West as a matter of principle, as they were hostile to any innovation that could have threatened their privileged status in Ottoman society. Ahmed III, Damad İbrahim and their government were in favour of the adoption of Western ways, he argues. Ahmed Refik puts the blame squarely on the *ulema* for having toppled the Ottoman government and dethroned Ahmed III, particularly blaming Zülâli Hasan Efendi.<sup>186</sup> He continues that the buildings of Saadabad and the other *köşks* and *kasırs*, buildings 'set up in the name of Western art', were destroyed.<sup>187</sup> In claiming the utter destruction of the layout at Kâğıthane, Ahmed Refik appears here to contradict his own *Lâle Devri* (1913/15), which contains the assertion that Sultan Mahmud I's personal intervention saved Saadabad and its attendant structures.<sup>188</sup> It seems that in this instance (1919), Ahmed Refik himself had come under the sway of the *Tarih-i Cevdet*, the book he condemned earlier and which had established the 'story' of Saadabad's destruction as a historical fact.

Ahmed Refik claims that the object of Damad İbrahim's wider cultural patronage was to disseminate general ideas of civilisation and aesthetic values, disclosing his teleological interpretation of the 'Tulip Age'. The implication in this statement is that the only civilisation worth propagating in such a manner was the civilisation of the West. He continues that these beneficial works were destroyed by the *ulema* who opposed the West. In other words, Ahmed Refik implies that his protagonists Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim were individuals ahead of their time. Their progressive nature was such that the backward and ignorant population, spurred by greedy and selfish members of the *ulema*, could not comprehend their seemingly outlandish habits and predilections which would prove to be beneficial in the long run.

Ahmed Refik next considers the assertion that throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century, from Mahmud I (1730-54) until Selim III (1789-1807), the *ulema* continued to live and thrive in a hermetically sealed cocoon of Oriental wisdom and learning. In other words, their accumulated knowledge was of no consequence at all, as it had been completely out of step with developments in the contemporary world.<sup>189</sup> And, as if to drive his point home, he adds that the underlying reason for this backwardness was to be found in the deficient character of the *medrese* curricula.<sup>190</sup> The narrative ends with a recounting of Selim III's fate, as another Ottoman reformer whose life was curtailed as a result of the prevalence of ignorance and bigotry encouraged by the members of the *ulema*.<sup>191</sup> His final verdict is that the overwhelming influence

of the *ulema* had not just caused the state administration to collapse but had also condemned the people to a life of ignorance.<sup>192</sup> Ahmed Refik had now effectively transformed the era of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim into a model for coming generations of historians and writers. Ahmed Refik showed himself to have been a writer with a programmatic approach to history in general, and to the figures of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim, in particular. His various writings suggest that with regard to the appreciation of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim, the negative verdict most recently reiterated by Cevdet Paşa's daughter should be abandoned in favour of a more sympathetic reading of the latter part of Ahmed III's reign. Basing himself on his own rather confused and uneven text on Damad İbrahim Paşa's *sadâret*, Ahmed Refik proclaimed the 'Tulip Age' the earliest era in Ottoman history to have seen a government-led drive towards modernising reforms.

### The Emergence of the 'Tulip Age' as a Concept

The phrase 'Tulip Age' became rather commonplace in 'Turkey' after its publication in book-form. In 1919, for example, the intellectual Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın] published a short piece entitled 'Lâle Devrinde Saadabad Akşamları' in his collection *Geçmiş Günler*.<sup>193</sup> Ruşen Eşref had first communicated the contents of this nostalgic article as an informal talk to members of the *Dârülmüâlimin* (teachers' college) on 13 March 1332/1917. In a rather wistful voice he recalls the pleasures and entertainments that had been enjoyed at Saadabad under Damad İbrahim Paşa. He replicates Mustafa Nuri's claim that the Grand Vezir had only restored the fortresses of Vidin and Niş to then immerse himself in festivities.<sup>194</sup> He also lists some of the poetic names given to certain tulip varieties at the time, such as 'Tac-ı kayserler' (Crown of Emperors), 'Şahbânûlar' (Woman Emperors), 'Sim-endâmlar' (Silver Bodies), and 'Düşizeler' (Girls).<sup>195</sup> As a consequence, he refers to the joyful poems sung by Nedim at the time.<sup>196</sup> Rather than associating the mention of the term 'Tulip Age' with progress and modernity, Ruşen Eşref's words indicate that the term *Lâle Devri* had by this stage come to denote an age of carefree pleasure and joy.

In 1336/1920 Dr. Rifât Osman published a study on the palace of Edirne, the *Saray-ı Cedid-i Amire*, which confirms such a development. In spite of the study's very specific subject-matter, its pages nevertheless contain an important claim regarding the perception of Ahmed III and the 'Tulip Age'. The palace in question had originally been built by Murad II (1421-51). But even after the conquest of Constantinople (1453), a great many sultans spent time in Edirne and had, as a natural course, embellished the city's imperial palace. In particular Mehmed IV resided in the palace in the second half of the seventeenth century. In his *Lâle Devri* Ahmed Refik himself points to Sultan Mehmed's reign as the

point of origin of the tulip fashion, which was to dominate the 1720s.<sup>197</sup> In 1336/1920 Dr. Rifât Osman pronounces the following interesting commentary:

Whereas our history credits this sultan [Mehmed IV]'s son Ahmed III with having lived through a Tulip Age with its passion for rearing tulips, its mansions, gardens, pools, cascades, poets and beauties, [in fact] before the son [had done so] his father had already brought this era to life in [his palace in] Edirne but it did not come to fruition until the era of Ahmed III.<sup>198</sup>

Rifât Osman characterises Ahmed III as the sultan whose reign has become identified with the mention of a ‘Tulip Age’, which he describes as a time witnessing an enthusiastic cultivation of tulips and a far-reaching architectural patronage meant to supply suitable backdrops, such as pleasure palaces, gardens, pools and cascades, for various entertainments. These building works correspond to the various parts of the Saadabad layout at Kâğıthane. Dr. Osman alludes next to a certain atmosphere of refinement and even a sexual excitement, by means of conjuring up the poets and courtesans of Ahmed III partaking in the ‘Tulip Age’. In other words, Rifât Osman’s words indicate that in space of nearly a decade (1912-20) the phrase apparently devised by Yahya Kemal and employed by Ahmed Refik had become more or less commonly accepted and acknowledged. The way Dr. Osman talks about a ‘Tulip Age’, however, seems to indicate that the phrase at that stage was simply used to describe the earlier verdict on Damad İbrahim as a sybarite supervising a hedonistic era of excess and flower cultivation. At the outset of the Constitutional era, Ahmed Râsim recounted the earlier Ottoman verdict on the early eighteenth century as a period devoid of progress and totally inwardly focused. Ahmed Râsim reiterated Cevdet and Nuri Paşa’s depictions of Damad İbrahim as a hedonist, suggesting the name ‘Tulip Entertainments’ to characterise the latter part of Ahmed III’s reign. A couple of years later Ahmed Refik published his insights on the Grand Vezir, hinting at more positive achievements, arguably more in line with nineteenth- and early twentieth-century developments. But it seems his efforts to convince the early twentieth-century Turkish public of Damad İbrahim Paşa’s progressive nature had failed. Instead, the phrase ‘Tulip Age’, which he had popularised in his numerous writings, became synonymous with pleasurable excesses more in line with Ahmed Râsim’s portrayal of Damad İbrahim.



## **Part II**

# **THE KEMALIST PERCEPTION OF DAMAD İBRAHİM PAŞA, 1923-47**



## Chapter II/1

# The Establishment of the Turkish Republic and the Quest for a New Historiography,

1923-30

Kemalism is a movement which is completely befitting Anatolia; . . . a movement of universal appeal, in the same league as Christianity and Islam.

Burhan Belge in *La Turquie Kemaliste* (1937)\*

### The Kemalist Republic

At the end of the 1910s, the cessation of the Great War (World War I) and the subsequent disintegration of the Ottoman Empire were events that necessarily influenced contemporary historians and other intellectuals alike. At the time, Ahmed Refik, as a prominent figure, contributed to a certain introspection among Ottoman citizens with his columns ‘Tarihden Alınacak Dersler’ (‘Lessons to be learned from History’) in the daily *İkdam* (1919-22). As a well-known historian, Ahmed Refik obviously saw it as his duty to supply his readers with exemplary historical cases, enabling the public to come to terms with the disaster that had beset the Ottomans and their empire. While the capital was languishing under foreign occupation, an Anatolian resistance movement confronted foreign occupation under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Paşa, whom Turkish public opinion subsequently came to see as the inspiration that garnered the Anatolian population into a quasi-spontaneous uprising against imperialist designs on the Turkish homeland. The historian Erik Zürcher, in contrast, claims that it was the secret society *Karakol* that appointed Mustafa Kemal to head the armed opposition.<sup>1</sup> The leading Unionists Mehmed Talat and Enver Paşas set up the *Karakol Cemiyeti* in the last week of October 1918. Ten years later (1928), Halide Edib [Adivar], who had also actively taken part in the War of Independence, recalls that ‘[t]he organisation which was most important . . . was a secret society called “Karakol”, that is, “The Guard”’.<sup>2</sup> The formation of the Turkish nationalist movement possessed a definite Ottoman inspiration, rather than being the outcome of a spontaneous ‘Turkish’ reaction to foreign occupation.



The resistance movement, generally referred to as the Kemalists,<sup>3</sup> set up a provisional government in Ankara, where Turkey's Grand National Assembly (TBMM) was convened on 23 April 1920.<sup>4</sup> The struggle against the occupying forces was concluded with the cease-fire of Mudanya (11 October 1922).<sup>5</sup> The Kemalists then abolished the institution of the sultanate on 1 November 1922, establishing the official schism between the Ottoman and Turkish states in the population's perception.<sup>6</sup> Ahmed Refik used his association with the daily *İkdam* to support this radical move with an article entitled 'Hilâfet Meselesi ve Yeni Türkiye': '2 Teşrin-i Sâni 1338 [2 November 1922] is the date of the liberation of the Turkish nation'. He shows himself a true supporter of the concept of national sovereignty by stating that power, until then held by the Ottoman dynasty, had now passed into the hands of the people. The historian characterises the Ottoman sultans as despotic rulers whose arbitrary regime was brought to an end on 2 November: '[i]t is correct to start the Turks' history from this date'. Ahmed Refik underlines the legitimacy of the nationalist government in Ankara. Even though the author had been a fervent supporter of the Ottoman dynasty's authority (albeit in the shape of a constitutional monarchy),<sup>7</sup> the calamities caused by the Unionist regime, the Ottoman entry into the Great War and the subsequent occupation of Anatolia and İstanbul had apparently forced him to readjust his political allegiance: from a conservative monarchist he evolved into a progressive nationalist. In this article Ahmed Refik elaborates upon the historical and historiographical implications of the Ottomans' disappearance, trying to highlight the purely Turkish character of national history. He even seems to hint at developments to come in the field of Turkish history writing: '[t]he Turks have a thousands of years' old, brilliant, astounding and grandiose history'.<sup>8</sup>

On the political scene, Mustafa Kemal founded the *Halk Fırkası* (People's Party) on 9 September 1923, which was to become first the *Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası* and eventually the *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi* (Republican People's Party).<sup>9</sup> Approximately three months following the signature of the Treaty of Lausanne (24 July 1923), which reversed the Sèvres agreement (10 August 1920), on 29 October 1923, the TBMM declared the Republic of Turkey the successor state of the Ottoman Empire in Anatolia and eastern Thrace.<sup>10</sup> In Erik Zürcher's view, this sudden shift to a republican form of government was 'really the result of a coup d'état by a radical wing within the movement for the defence of national rights led by Mustafa Kemal Pasha'. Subsequently, the leadership of the *Halk Fırkası* and its Kemalist cadres began the construction of a Turkish homeland on the peninsula between the Black and Mediterranean seas (Anatolia) in earnest through its active propaganda efforts and social engineering.<sup>11</sup> In the first three years of the Republic's existence Mustafa Kemal, popularly known as the *Gazi* or *Halâskâr Gazi* (the Champion of the faith or the

Liberator Champion), gradually established his hold over Turkey's political establishment, 'pushing aside his competitors, mostly leaders of the independence movement with a Young Turk background'.<sup>12</sup> The *Gazi* 'finally eliminated [these rivals] through a series of political show trials' in 1926.<sup>13</sup> In this way personal links between the Republican and Ottoman establishments were seemingly erased from public scrutiny and Mustafa Kemal started publicising his interpretation of Turkey's history, which emphasised 'his own role and the novelty and originality of the national movement he led', as worded by Zürcher.<sup>14</sup>

### Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin

Following the establishment of the Republic of Turkey as one-party state, its government quickly constituted a working infrastructure, highly reliant on preceding Ottoman institutions.<sup>15</sup> A case in point is the *Maarif Vekâleti* (Ministry of Education), founded in 1923, replacing the İstanbul government's *Maarif Nezâreti*.<sup>16</sup> The issue of the historiographical representation of the Ottoman Empire and the 'Turkish nation' was immediately seized upon by this organisation. The history textbooks produced in the Constitutional period were obviously no longer judged appropriate reading material for Turkey's pupils. The issue of the 'Tulip Age' even received official exposure in the crucial year 1926 when the *Maarif Vekâleti* published a school textbook recounting the history of 'Turkey' from the fall of Constantinople to the present day: *Kurûn-ı Cedidde ve Asr-ı Hâzırda Türkiye Tarihi*.<sup>17</sup> The textbook, written by Ahmed Hâmid [Ongunsu] and Mustafa Muhsin [Tekel], was a first attempt by the government to actively influence the way in which younger generations thought about the past and Turkey's relationship with the preceding Ottoman centuries.<sup>18</sup>

The school textbook presents the development of the final 465 years of the Ottoman Empire as a prelude to the emergence of the Republic. The period under consideration is divided into four segments: rise, 1453-1579, stagnation, 1579-1683, retreat, 1683-1792, followed by the contemporary era, 1789-1914, which includes the periods of the *Tanzimat*, 1839-1908, and of the *Meşrûtiyet*, 1908-1914. Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin single out Sultan Süleyman's vezir Rüstem Paşa (*sadâret* 1555-61) as the first to have institutionalised the sale of government offices and thus as the first to have actively undermined the Ottoman system.<sup>19</sup> But still they identify the death of Sokollu Paşa in 1579 as the starting point of the waning of the Ottomans' fortunes.<sup>20</sup> In keeping with the atmosphere of the time, the tone of the book is explicitly 'nationalist'. Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin appear to be under the particular sway of Ziya Gökalp's criticism of the *Tanzimat*, a stance they replicate in their textbook.<sup>21</sup>

The section dealing with Ahmed III contains an interesting appraisal of

Damad İbrahim Paşa, even allotting him a separate chapter.<sup>22</sup> The authors indicate İbrahim Paşa's nefarious influence over the Sultan.<sup>23</sup> Still, the authors appear rather positive about Damad İbrahim's achievements at first. They claim that the Damad had been a strong proponent of a peaceful policy.<sup>24</sup> İbrahim Paşa's resolve to encourage peaceful relations was to determine his activities as a Grand Vezir, Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin add:

After he became Grand Vezir he devoted his greatest possible effort to achieving this goal . . . subsequently, he worked towards improving the country, towards augmenting its scientific, [and] economic standing for the duration of his *sadâret* lasting twelve and a half years.<sup>25</sup>

The authors' words of praise for the Damad's attempts to secure public improvements and scientific as well as economic progress, however, are followed by a bleak appraisal of İbrahim Paşa's actual *sadâret*:

The Paşa set up a number of institutions during that time, he worked towards achieving progress in literature and art, but as if the Treaty of Passarowitz were a document of victory, he did not shy away from opening up an era of pleasure, and sacrificing for this purpose millions that ought to have been spent on the army and on institutions serving the common good.<sup>26</sup>

The authors elaborate upon Cevdet and Nuri's earlier condemnation of Damad İbrahim.<sup>27</sup> Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin claim that Damad İbrahim had used the Passarowitz agreement as a pretext for inaugurating an 'era of pleasure'.

### **Damad İbrahim and the Printing Press**

In the subsequent narrative relating Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*, the authors rely heavily on Ahmed Refik's insights, mentioning that the name 'Tulip Age' is also given to İbrahim Paşa's period of office.<sup>28</sup> They mention the architectural activity pervading İstanbul at the time, and add that these buildings were used as backdrops for many splendid entertainments. Their reliance on Ahmed Refik's *Lâle Devri* appears irrefutable when dealing with the stylistic properties of the various buildings set up. They replicate Ahmed Refik's statements regarding the presence of architectural styles pertaining both to Isfahan and Versailles in early eighteenth-century İstanbul.<sup>29</sup> In this way they relocate Albert Vandal's exoticist description of eighteenth-century İstanbul into twentieth-century Turkey.<sup>30</sup>

The authors next consider the Damad's achievements, concluding that his patronage of the printing press had been most beneficial for the land.<sup>31</sup> They relate Yirmisekiz Çelebi's mission, Mehmed Said Efendi's important contribution and İbrahim Müteferrika's role in the founding of the printing press.<sup>32</sup> In their view, the books printed by Müteferrika had produced three significant outcomes. Firstly, more and more people in the Ottoman lands became well-versed in history and geography. Secondly, the Sublime Porte was no longer a stranger to European diplomacy. And finally there had been the beginning of a better appreciation of what was needed to further the good of the country.<sup>33</sup>

Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin reproduce these claims only to distance themselves from them. They point out that, in fact, the subsequent conflicts with Russia demonstrated that not just 'the people' but even all the 'members of the government' had been 'ignorant' in the extreme.<sup>34</sup> This reference to ignorant high officials seems to be an allusion to the disastrous wars waged against Catherine the Great (1762-96) in the latter part of the eighteenth century (1768-74, 1787-92). Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin are highly critical of the Ottoman elite, saying that the 'Sublime Porte' had become a mere 'toy in the hands of ignorant people and hedonists'. Certain commentators nevertheless maintain that this era had been an 'age of awakening and renewal' or even a 'Renaissance' ('*intibâh ve teceddüd . . . rönesâns*'), they report.<sup>35</sup> As a result of their critical stance, the authors cast severe 'doubt' ('*tereddüd*') upon claims that the 'Tulip Age' had seen the beginning of an awakening or a Renaissance. Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin, acting as spokesmen for the early Republican establishment, thus seem to indicate that the idea of a 'Tulip Age' as an early precursor of Ottoman-Turkish attempts to modernise local society and civilisation, was not accepted by the Turkish intelligentsia of the 1920s.

They nevertheless list the beneficial efforts of Damad İbrahim, from setting up a printing press, through organising a fire brigade to encouraging the industrial production of tiles, textiles and (erroneously) paper.<sup>36</sup> In addition, the authors also mention the translation committees Damad İbrahim had set up, and refer to Ahmed Refik's anachronistic claim that the Grand Vezir had wanted to set up a *Nizam-ı Cedid* army unit.<sup>37</sup> By way of a final statement on the issue, Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin avow certain positive aspects present during Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*:

İbrahim Paşa, taking account of the weaknesses of the state was reluctant [to engage in] war and had instead given importance to pursuing a life of ease and pleasure, taking inspiration from the increased contacts that he had achieved with Europe, and the hedonistic [and] at the same time his peace-loving inclinations that his palace culture had given him. This age,

despite being remarkable for its extravagance, and despite the fact that this had given rise to a reaction, can be regarded as an incomplete and possibly unconscious attempt at moving away from mediaeval life and [instead] moving towards the progress of Europe, without however exaggerating [its importance].<sup>38</sup>

As a result, the way in which the Patrona Halil revolt is presented in the textbook differs considerably from Ahmed Refik's idea of the rebellion as being connected with opposition to innovations imported from the West.

Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin dwell upon Damad İbrahim Paşa's nepotism and subsequent accumulation of wealth. This led to a low public estimation of the Grand Vezir in contemporary İstanbul.<sup>39</sup> This public antipathy led to a rebellion.<sup>40</sup> The authors stress the fact that the Damad's nepotism had led numerous members of İstanbul's upper classes, including two members of the *ulema* whom they refer to with the derogatory term 'sarıklı' ('turbaned'), 'the preacher of the Ayasofya, İspirizâde, and the Albanian Zülâli Hasan Efendi, one of the kadıs of İstanbul, to incite the common people, tradesmen and Janisaries into open rebellion.<sup>41</sup> And they indicate that the events in Iran acted as the ostensible reason for this outbreak, in a manner rather reminiscent of Mustafa Nuri's work.<sup>42</sup> Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin, acting as spokesmen of the Republic, appear to recognise the extraordinary status of Damad İbrahim's tenure as Grand Vezir. But rather than wholeheartedly supporting Ahmed Refik's reading of the era, they present the idea of a 'Tulip Age' as a new beginning with some reservation.

### Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin's Kemalist Credentials

Following the narrative of Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*, the textbook relates the remaining years of the Ottoman Empire leading up to the establishment of the Republic in 1923. In keeping with their espousal of Ziya Gökalp's precepts, the authors are severely critical of the *Tanzimat*, although they recognise a certain modernising trend to have been present at the time. The authors call the period following the end of the First World War a 'national awakening'.<sup>43</sup> They present the Republic as the culmination of a development that had started with the *Tanzimat* and was carried on during the Second Constitutional era: the advancement of the adoption of the norms and values of the civilised world. The authors describe the *Tanzimat's* efforts as hesitant, the *Meşrûtiyet's* as confused, but they are unequivocally positive about the Republic, as its moves were guided by Mustafa Kemal himself, whom they call the 'great leader'. They describe the Republic of Turkey as a 'civilised' state, with a 'nationalist', 'democratic' and 'secular' ('lâyik') structure.<sup>44</sup> The school textbook *Türkiye Tarihi* thus

largely adhered to the Kemalist version of Turkey's history, which was to assume 'the status of absolute truth' in the years to come.<sup>45</sup>

The final sections of the textbook describe the revolutionary innovations that were promulgated in the Republic's first years. Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin announce in a triumphant voice the abolition of the Caliphate and the proclamation of the *Tevhid-i Tedrisat Kanunu* (Law on the Unification of Education),<sup>46</sup> effectively abolishing the institution of the *medrese*, on 3 March 1924.<sup>47</sup> In a succinct fashion they further list the forced exile of the members of the Ottoman dynasty, the closure of *Tekkes* and *Zaviyes*<sup>48</sup> and the adoption of the hat in favour of the *fez*.<sup>49</sup> These accomplishments all fall under the general heading of a 'national awakening'. The fact that this vocabulary of awakening mirrors the concepts introduced by Ahmed Refik to describe the 'Tulip Age' can not have escaped the authors' attention. But their partial rejection of Ahmed Refik's view of Ahmed III's reign and their adoption of Mustafa Kemal's reinterpretation of history, which underlines the 'novelty and originality' of the Republic, means that they deliberately do not draw a parallel between the developments in the 1720s and those of the 1920s.

### Ali Canib and a Progressive Vezir

Towards the end of 1926, Ali Canib [Yöntem] published an interesting article in *Hayat* characterising Damad İbrahim as a progressive vezir: "Tecdüdperver Vezirlerden: İbrahim Paşa."<sup>50</sup> In spite of Damad İbrahim's mixed reputation at the outset of the Republican era, the writer, poet and political activist Ali Canib decided to publicise the eighteenth-century vezir in a popular periodical aimed at Turkey's urban classes. It is a matter of interest that he does not mention Ahmed Refik's work, instead basing his views on such respected historians and chroniclers as Ahmed Cevdet, Çelebizâde Âsım and Râşid Mehmed. Ali Canib does not speak about a 'Tulip Age', instead calling the 13-year administration of the vezir a sultanate, even claiming that this appellation was commonly accepted.<sup>51</sup>

Ali Canib describes Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* as an era filled with 'civilised activity', readily acknowledging, however, the vezir's indulgence in hedonistic pursuits. He maintains that the historical context had been conducive to such pursuits, not accusing the vezir of a penchant for wasteful expenditure and debauchery. As a result, he takes issue with Ahmed Cevdet, in view of his condemnation of Damad İbrahim:

There is some unfairness in the late Cevdet Paşa's saying of İbrahim Paşa that "he did not think about anything but [wasteful] expenditure and en-

joyment, [and that] in his opinion the terms 'soldier' and 'battle' became terms of abuse".<sup>52</sup>

Contrary to Ahmed Refik, Ali Canib does not attack the renowned Ottoman historian outright. He suggests that Ahmed Cevdet's harsh criticism of Damad İbrahim could be seen as a 'little unjustified'. Ahmed Refik had earlier been much more acerbic in his criticism of the *Tarih-i Cevdet*, even accusing the renowned historian of simply copying the account of Şemdanizâde.<sup>53</sup> In the course of the remaining pages, Ali Canib then sets out to restore Damad İbrahim's name. He calls the vezir peace-loving, and basing himself on the *vakanüvis* Çelebizâde Âsim's account, he lists such beneficial enterprises as the vezir's establishment of translation committees, his commission of the building of a library within the Topkapı palace compound and of a *Darülbadis* (Institution for the study of Prophetic traditions) and library in the neighbourhood of Şehzâdebaşı.<sup>54</sup> Next, turning to the Grand Vezir's architectural patronage, he relies on the work of the *vakanüvis* Râşid.<sup>55</sup> Quite naturally, Ali Canib stresses the position of Saadabad and the area of Kâğıthane in this context.<sup>56</sup>

But the development and beautification of the urban framework of İstanbul only occupy a secondary place in Ali Canib's appreciation of Damad İbrahim Paşa as a 'progressive vezir'. He views the vezir's encouragement of the foundation of a printing press as indicative of Damad İbrahim's true greatness, qualifying this patronage as the Damad's 'most valuable service'. Ali Canib claims that Damad İbrahim's actions were contrary to the then prevailing mood of fanaticism and ignorance, living and acting as he was 'in an age of most extreme medrese bigotry'. He characterises the Damad as 'an enlightened man', ahead of his time and endowed with critical reason. İbrahim Paşa encouraged the art of print, which was seen as an 'unlawful innovation' by the general population and members of the *medrese* establishment whose influence on public opinion was paramount.<sup>57</sup> As outlined before, the issue of *medreses* and their influence on Ottoman or Turkish society had given rise to a lively debate at the outset of the twentieth century.<sup>58</sup> The above-mentioned *Tevhid-i Tedrisat Kanunu* led to their abolition two years before Ali Canib's article was published. Ali Canib used his piece on Damad İbrahim to underline the negative influence of the *medrese*, equating this institution with bigotry and fanaticism. In the end, Ali Canib views Damad İbrahim's patronage of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's mission to Paris and his subsequent encouragement of Mehmed Said and İbrahim Müteferrika as proof of the vezir's attempt to secure the introduction of 'Western civilisation' into the Ottoman lands.<sup>59</sup>

He ends his positive account of Damad İbrahim as one of the 'progressive vezirs' active in the Ottoman period with an appraisal of the Patrona Halil rebellion, which he links with the widespread bigotry and fanaticism rampant in

the Ottoman population. The rebels, aided by the populace subject to an atmosphere of obscurantism spread by the teachings of the backward *medrese* system, overthrew the government and had the Grand Vizir executed:

Other than a number of fountains that still embellish İstanbul, only a fairy-tale has remained of the reign of Damad İbrahim Paşa.

Ali Canib's judgement on the popular image of the latter part of Ahmed III's reign as an Oriental 'fairy tale' seems to ignore Ahmed Refik's strenuous efforts to popularise Damad İbrahim as a precursor of the propagators of the *Tanzimat* and as the instigator of a 'Renaissance in Turkey' during the last years of the previous régime.<sup>60</sup> Instead it would appear that Ali Canib had been influenced primarily by Abdurrahman Şeref's account of the Grand Vezir as having introduced the principle of progress into the Ottoman sphere by means of his patronage of the printing press.<sup>61</sup>

### The Popular Press

Ali Canib's article indicates that on a popular level there was still an interest in the era of Ahmed III at the time. Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın]'s collection *Geçmiş Günler*, containing a wistful piece on Saadabad and Damad İbrahim,<sup>62</sup> for example, was also reprinted in 1924.<sup>63</sup> The writer and critic Refik Ahmed [Sevengil] published a collection of essays on the various entertainments enjoyed by İstanbul's population throughout the city's Ottoman period (*Fetihden Zamanımıza Kadar*), which contain extensive coverage of the 'Tulip Age'.<sup>64</sup> These short pieces were written in a very light-hearted tone and were clearly not meant to appeal to a serious readership. The collection contains nine individual compositions dealing with Ahmed III, Damad İbrahim, or some aspect of the 'Tulip Age'. These writings relate İbrahim Paşa's influence on the lives of İstanbul's early eighteenth-century inhabitants, particularly on their pastimes and pleasures. Refik Ahmed's book should therefore be seen as constituting an important moment in the popularisation of the phrase 'Tulip Age' coined by Yahya Kemal and Ahmed Refik.

Even though Refik Ahmed [Sevengil] was instrumental in increasing popular awareness of the phrase 'Tulip Age', his message appears to be an approval of Ahmed Cevdet's verdict of Damad İbrahim. In the pieces, İbrahim Paşa lives up to his reputation as a sybarite not concerned with the welfare of the state but only with his own enjoyment and well-being. The individual pieces elaborate on specific themes launched by Ahmed Refik earlier, such as the lively architectural patronage in the 1720s,<sup>65</sup> the importance of the construction of Saadabad,<sup>66</sup> the popularity of so-called *Çınağan* entertainments in the summer and



*Helva Sobbetleri* in the winter,<sup>67</sup> and the extraordinary propensity of women to indulge in expensive clothes and embellishments.<sup>68</sup> The way in which he presents these themes only helps to underline the view that during the 1720s the city of İstanbul had been engulfed by a hedonistic craze encouraged by the then Grand Vezir and other high officials. Ahmed Refik used these themes as backdrops for his message that the 'Tulip Age' marked a new beginning in the Ottoman Empire's development towards a modern state. In contrast, Refik Ahmed [Sevengil] transforms Damad İbrahim into a popular figure, a figure on the same level as the characters of Karagöz and Hacivat in the minds of the literate population of Turkey.

### **The TOE and the TTE: Historiography and Politics**

The historian Ahmed Refik himself was relatively inactive during the first years of the Republic's existence. The historiographical organisation of the previous decade, the *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni*, ceased to be active during the 'War of Independence' (1919-22). Ahmed Refik at the time was nevertheless busy trying to keep the topic of history writing and its patronage in the spotlight of public opinion, as indicated by Hasan Akbayrak.<sup>69</sup> Following the establishment of the Republic, its authorities allocated special funds for the society, renamed the *Türk Tarihi Encümeni* (*TTE*). When Abdurrahman Şeref died on 18 February 1925, Ahmed Refik quite naturally succeeded him as chairman of the renamed society as its most prominent and active member.

As a prominent historian of the Ottoman cause, Ahmed Refik, the new chairman of the government-sponsored *TTE*, was nevertheless regarded as somewhat suspect. Approximately a month prior to his unexpected promotion, the Kemalist regime was severely shaken.<sup>70</sup> On 4 January 1925, the Nakşbendi Sheikh Said issued a *fetva* that condemned the government of Ankara and its leader Mustafa Kemal for destroying religion. The *fetva* thus declares rebellion against the Ankara administration lawful and incumbent upon every true believer.<sup>71</sup> The newly appointed Prime Minister İsmet Paşa [İnönü] subsequently passed the *Takrir-i Sükûn Kanunu* (Law of the Maintenance of Order) on 4 March 1925, to be in place for the coming four years.<sup>72</sup> This measure was primarily a reaction against the emergence of armed opposition to the Kemalist regime, but in those four years the most drastic Westernist reforms (carrying the name *İnkılâb*) were introduced as well.<sup>73</sup> These reforms were supposed to transform Turkey into a new country, into a new European nation state even. Halide Edib [Adivar] characterises the Kemalist state during these years as the 'Turkish dictatorship' in her *Turkey faces West*.<sup>74</sup>

Against the backdrop of these important developments in 1925, premises in İstanbul which allegedly housed the headquarters of the 'reactionary' organi-

sation *Tarikat-ı Salâhiye Cemiyeti*, founded 1920,<sup>75</sup> were raided. A document dated 1337, corresponding to 1921, describes the 'aim and goal' of this organisation as 'the worldwide spread of the religion of Muhammed and dissemination of the civilisation of Islam'.<sup>76</sup> The evidence found in the house also implicated Ahmed Refik. The hapless historian was subsequently arrested and transported to the capital on 8 July 1925, where he was incarcerated. In Ankara, Ahmed Refik faced trial at the Ankara İstiklâl Tribunal, and was questioned as a suspected member of the *Tarikat-ı Salâhiye*, as reported in the daily *Cumhuriyet*.<sup>77</sup> After having spent approximately a month in jail, on 15 August 1925, Ahmed Refik was acquitted. At his trial, the historian claimed that he was added to the list of suspected members due to his contacts with Kiraz Hamdi Paşa, Sultan Vahdeddin's *Fabri Yâver* (honorary aide-de-camp) and a prominent figure well-known for his anti-nationalistic activities. Ahmed Refik stated that he had been asked to make corrections to Kiraz Hamdi's work on the Ottoman dynasty. The historian even attended one of the *Tarikat-ı Salâhiye*'s meetings, where he was informed that he had been elected to head one of the organisations sub-groups. But, Ahmed Refik added, he had never been interested in it.<sup>78</sup> In addition, the journalist and well-known supporter of the Caliphate,<sup>79</sup> Lütfi Fikri, was also released. But 11 others charged were summarily executed on 16 August 1925.<sup>80</sup> It seems ironic that Ahmed Refik, as an Ottoman historian who had used his pen to support Westernist reform policies during the Constitutional era and who also supported the recent abolition of the sultanate, was suspected of belonging to a reactionary, and pro-Caliphate organisation.

In the summer of 1927, the Ministry of Education published the new statutes and programme of the *TTE*, which effectively re-assembled the organisation as a Republican and pro-Kemalist establishment.<sup>81</sup> A few days later this development was carried in the daily *Cumhuriyet*, an indication of the level of importance allotted to the issue.<sup>82</sup> The paper's reporter conducted an interview with Ahmed Refik, still the *TTE*'s chairman, who had come to Ankara to attend meetings regarding the changes affecting the History Society. The reporter asks Ahmed Refik to clarify the *TTE*'s new statutes. The chairman explains that the reformed *Encümen*, consisting of ten members, was to occupy itself with issues relating to 'national history'. He also stresses that the *TTE* was to be part of İstanbul's *Darülfünûn* (university), as an academic establishment dealing with the issues of history and history writing. Ahmed Refik finishes his announcements by stating that the existing Historical Society (*TOE*) had been abolished, and that from henceforth the Society (*TTE*) was directly subject to the stipulations of the Ministry of Education.<sup>83</sup> The *TTE*'s first general meeting was an event deemed worthy to be frontpage news (22 September 1927).<sup>84</sup>

On 29 September 1927, during the *TTE*'s second general meeting, Ahmed

Refik was forced to resign as its chairman.<sup>85</sup> His sudden fall from grace might be related to his earlier arrest as an alleged anti-Kemalist activist. The *Cumhuriyet* reporter relating the event, however, records the suspicion that Ahmed Refik's disputes and disagreements with Köprülü[zâde] Mehmed Fuad, who succeeded him at the head of the *TTE*, were behind his resignation.<sup>86</sup> This dispute can be seen as yet another indication of the difficulties Ahmed Refik was to experience in the Republic. His ostensible rival, Köprülüâde Mehmed Fuad, had been a well-known Turkist intellectual since the early 1910s. Ziya Gökalp had instigated Köprülüâde's appointment as a *müderriis* (professor) at the *Darülfünûn* on 20 December 1913/1329. Throughout the final years of the Ottoman Empire he had been very active, writing in various periodicals and publishing important books which established his reputation as a serious scholar of history and literature.<sup>87</sup> After the establishment of the Republic he was appointed director of the *Türkiyât Enstitüsü* (Institute of Turcology), established in 1924. Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, as he was to become known later on, fulfilled an important function in the Republican establishment's attempts to receive international academic credibility.<sup>88</sup> The year following his appointment as the head of the *TTE* he even travelled to Oxford to attend the prestigious *Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists* (28-31 August 1928). At the congress he was able to meet such renowned Orientalists as C. Snouck Hurgronje, Franz Babinger and Vladimir Minorsky.<sup>89</sup>

Aside from such personal quarrels, the *TTE* was quite active in the Republic's first decade, publishing the findings and research results of its members in the organisation's renamed periodical, the *Türk Tarihi Encümeni Mecmuası* (*TTEM*). The *TTE* turned out to be a collection of individual historians publishing the fruits of their research, similar to the nature of the *TOE* during the Constitutional era.<sup>90</sup> In 1924, for instance, the periodical's editorial board published Avram Galanti [Bodrumlu]'s article on the foundation of Capucin monasteries in 'Turkey'.<sup>91</sup> In the same year Adburrahman Şeref was able to publish an article on the circumstances surrounding Sultan Abdülaziz's suspicious death (1876).<sup>92</sup> Ahmed Refik even published an article entitled 'Tevârihi Âl-i Osman' in the year 1926, dealing with the anonymous chronicle relating the beginnings of the dynastic line.<sup>93</sup> This small sample of published articles discloses that, far from being in line with the above-mentioned 'new' approach to 'national history', the *TTE* was still functioning as an academic institution which acted as a vehicle for the dissemination of research on Ottoman history. Ahmed Refik was even in a position to further investigate the activities of Damad İbrahim Paşa, indicating he had not given up on championing the cause of Ahmed III and the 'Tulip Age'. Under the heading 'Anadolu Şehirleri', he published an account of Damad İbrahim's transformation of his home-town Muşkara into Nevşehir.<sup>94</sup>

The members of the *TTE* were also able to publish their findings in the form of books. In 1927 the Turkist Necib Asım [Yazıksız] re-published his *Türk Tarihi* of 1899.<sup>95</sup> This work appears to have been more in line with the official interest in 'national' history and historiography.<sup>96</sup> In spite of the composition's self-avowed Turkist agenda, the major part of the book still deals with the Turks' Islamic past.<sup>97</sup> Necib Asım's colleague Halil Edhem [Eldem] even ventured to publish a translation of Stanley Lane-Poole's *Mohammedan Dynasties* in the same year.<sup>98</sup> The translator made numerous additions for the Turkish readership and even ends the section on the Ottomans with the abolition of the sultanate, which led to the establishment of the Republic of Turkey.<sup>99</sup> Halil Edhem subsequently even lists the Republic as an Islamic state, indicative of the fact that the secularist tone of the state's governance was not yet firmly established at that stage.<sup>100</sup> The two above-mentioned historians had also been members of the Ottoman Historical Society (*TOE*), and this was clearly reflected in their publications, which stress the importance of Islam in a Turkish context. This was, however, an attitude that did not necessarily endear them or their work to the Republican authorities, who tried very hard to downplay this link.

The *TTE* was also concerned with the production of new school textbooks.<sup>101</sup> In 1926, for instance, Ahmed Refik, the then chairman of the *TTE* revised his multi-volume history textbook used by the previous administration, the *Büyük Tarih-i Umûmî*. The revised edition received the seemingly simpler title *Umûmî Tarih*.<sup>102</sup> In spite of Ahmed Refik's status as an Ottoman historian and champion of the 'Tulip Age', *Umûmî Tarih* deals only with antiquity and the medieval period. The book's scope does not reach the Ottomans. The sections dealing with the ancient Near East consider the peoples and civilisations of Egypt, Assyria and Chaldea, the Phoenicians, the Hittites, the Iranians and the Hebrews.<sup>103</sup> In view of the new government's insistence on 'national history', the chapter allotted to the Hittites, a bronze age civilisation in Anatolia, is of particular interest. Ahmed Refik starts out with the contention that the Hittites, whom he refers to as *Eti* in this revised textbook, had migrated into Anatolia from Asia. In the original *Tarih-i Umûmî* (1328/1912) he had called these prehistoric inhabitants of Anatolia 'Hititler', in accordance with European usage.<sup>104</sup> In spite of the fact that their material remains are visible throughout the whole of Anatolia, which in the original version he had referred to as 'Asia Minor' or 'Asya-ı Sâgrâ', Ahmed Refik had there rightly indicated that at the time (1912) full information was not available on this tribe or people who had occupied an important position in the ancient world as a result of the fact that its script had not yet been deciphered.<sup>105</sup>

In the Republican school textbook, published 1926, Ahmed Refik is more confident in supplying information on the topic of the Hittites. Following his

introductory statement about their migration into Anatolia, Ahmed Refik adds the following peculiar statement: '[t]heir origins have until now been assumed to have been Turanian'.<sup>106</sup> According to Mete Tunçay, it would appear that this extraordinary claim that the Hittites were of Turanian origin was first aired in a book entitled *Pontus Meselesi*, published under the auspices of the *Matbûât Müdüriyye-i Umûmiyyesi*, the provisional Ankara government's propaganda department, in 1338/1922.<sup>107</sup> Ahmed Refik explains that this surmise ('zann') had been current as a result of the fact that the Hittite script had at the time been unintelligible. But now that this scientific hiatus has been partially bridged (an obvious reference to the work done by the Czech linguist Franz Hrozny<sup>108</sup>), Ahmed Refik self-assuredly proclaims that the Hittites did not belong to the Turanian race.<sup>109</sup> As a result Ahmed Refik here unwittingly takes a firm stand on the issue of historical culture in Republican Turkey, a position which would bring him in opposition to the government in the subsequent decade.

The final section of the book considers the ancient, pre-Islamic Turks.<sup>110</sup> Ahmed Refik begins his account with the phrase '[t]he Turks' first fatherland is Central Asia', slightly altering the contention he had put forward in his earlier textbook *Küçük Tarih-i Osmani*,<sup>111</sup> prepared in the constitutional period.<sup>112</sup> The textbook *Umûmî Tarih* was reprinted in 1928, after the author's demotion in the ranks of the *TTE*. The new edition, however, placed a greater emphasis on European history.<sup>113</sup>

### Turkish Art in the Early Eighteenth Century

In the same year Celâl Esad [Arseven] published his *Türk Sanatı* ('Turkish Art'), merging nationalist sentiment with aesthetics. The work is of interest for a number of reasons. As indicated in chapter I/1, Celâl Esad here apparently replicates the statements he had made in his earlier French publication on the same topic.<sup>114</sup> In the text he relates the existence of a Persianate mood in the world of Ottoman aesthetics during the reign of Ahmed III. Celâl Esad also mentions that the name 'Tulip Age' is given to this era.<sup>115</sup> The book is divided into three large sections: the first dealing with Central Asian Turkish art, the second with Anatolian Turkish art, and the last with Turkish art pertaining to the Ottoman period.<sup>116</sup> This last chronological sequence is further sub-divided, including a small sub-section called the 'Tulip Age'.<sup>117</sup>

Celâl Esad declares that Ottoman art and architecture remained stuck for centuries in the mould established by Mimar Sinan in the sixteenth century.<sup>118</sup> Under the sub-heading 'Sanatda Aksülame'l' ('A Reaction in Art') he posits the important claim that the reign of Ahmed III had seen the onset of a 'new style' in reaction to the 'classical [Ottoman] style'.<sup>119</sup> This reaction consisted of a 'desire' to give 'art' a 'new power and revival'.<sup>120</sup> Following this surprising an-

nouncement the reference to an interaction with Iran and Iranian aesthetics, dealt with in chapter I/1, is brought to attention.<sup>121</sup> Celâl Esad introduces the sub-section 'Lâle Devri', in order to illuminate his claims regarding the 'new power and revival'.

The short sub-section mentions the beginning of the construction of the free-standing *çeşmes* (fountains) under Ahmed III, as well as a marked move towards applying a naturalist approach in decorative designs.<sup>122</sup> Then the author claims a continuity between Mehmed IV and Ahmed III's eras with regard to their stress on entertainment, architectural construction and certain types of decoration.<sup>123</sup> Celâl Esad ends the short section with the following remarkable sentence:

The renewal [that one can see] in the Tulip Age again took its inspiration from Europe in Ahmed III's time and was thus a forerunner of the subsequent age of [Ottoman] Baroque.<sup>124</sup>

In contrast with his earlier relation of the Ottoman inclination towards the east and Iran, Celâl Esad here speaks about a 'renewal' (using the value-laden term 'teceddüd', normally used to refer to the Renaissance) taking place during the 'Tulip Age', even presenting this statement as a commonly acknowledged piece of information. In view of his own insights regarding the importance of the Iranian tradition in early eighteenth-century Ottoman arts and aesthetics, he assigns this 'renewal' the status of being a forerunner of the coming era of Baroque aesthetics in Ottoman art, which he dates to the period 1730-1808, in turn, followed by the era of the *Empire* style.<sup>125</sup> These latter periods in Ottoman art had been clearly subject to European influence and beholden to Western examples.

Celâl Esad had obviously been aware of Ahmed Refik's work as he declares Saadabad to have been built upon plans furnished by the French ambassador the Marquis de Bonac, giving the event the erroneous date '1724 M'.<sup>126</sup> In this instance he seems to rely on Ahmed Refik's self-assured declaration, published in 1332/1916 that the Ottoman *kasır* had been set up as a 'copy' ('taklid') of Versailles.<sup>127</sup> The anecdotal account of the intervention of the Marquis de Bonac leads the author to consider Yirmisekiz Çelebi's mission to Paris. Celâl Esad seems not to have been aware of the ambassador's *Sefâretnâme*, as he refers to the numerous letters the Ottoman had supposedly sent back to İstanbul during his stay in France. He declares that these letters contained descriptions of French palaces and gardens which awakened a desire to have similar layouts constructed in İstanbul, and goes on to claim that the 'Tulip Age' thus marked the real beginning of the adoption of a European aesthetic.<sup>128</sup>

Celâl Esad claims that until the time of Ahmed III, Turks had found their

inspiration in the east.<sup>129</sup> In spite of his earlier-mentioned views on the nature and outlook of Ottoman visual culture under Ahmed III as being of a rather Persianate inspiration, Ahmed Refik's unrelenting advocacy of Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* as the beginning of an 'Ottoman awakening' seems to have moved Celâl Esad as well as some of his contemporaries to think of Ahmed III's era in terms of the beginnings of an opening move towards the West. From 1730 onwards, Celâl Esad then informs his readers, the Ottoman lands were covered in 'curling leaves and playful curves', totally alien to the Ottoman tradition.<sup>130</sup>

### The New Turkish Alphabet

This art-historical text seems to have a twofold message: on the one hand, the latter part of Ahmed III's reign is presented as containing indications of the emergence of changed attitudes, but at the same time its author does not seem to be completely prepared to abandon the idea of Ahmed III as an Oriental Ottoman at ease with the traditional appearance of the Islamic idiom.<sup>131</sup> The year of its publication, 1928, is significant in Turkish history. One could argue that the year initiated the official break with the earlier regime and with the whole cultural idiom of the Ottoman-Islamic heritage of the Anatolian Turks: on 1 November a new Latin alphabet was formally introduced.<sup>132</sup>

This measure appears to have had a double purpose. On the one hand, it created a link with the written culture of the West, where Latin alphabets had been in use for centuries. On the other hand, the policy created a fissure between Turkey and the Islamic world, as the Arabic script represented the language of the Koran, the Prophet and even God. Measures to alienate the Turkish population from Arabic were also underlined by the government-induced drive to broadcast the call to prayer (*ezan*) in Turkish from 8 March 1928 onwards.<sup>133</sup> Prior to the drastic measure of abolishing the script the government had presented a Turkish version of the Holy Book to the people. During the constitutional period there had been a practice of providing Turkish 'passage translations' of the Koran.<sup>134</sup> The publisher İbrahim Hilmi [Çığırçan], who edited a successful translation in 1926/1344, in particular praises the Republican government for having undertaken such a great pious service, which enabled millions of Turkish believers to learn about Islam in their own language.

The alphabet reform would make it virtually impossible in the long term for Turkish people to read the original words of the Holy Book. But this policy also meant that in future the literate public would become unable to consult historical source material relating to the Turks' Islamic past. In other words, the alphabet and subsequent language reforms succeeded in transforming the

Ottomans into museum pieces.<sup>135</sup> By way of a preparatory move for this important policy, Latin numerals replaced the Arabic ones that had been in use for centuries in May 1928.<sup>136</sup> Mustafa Kemal presented the new Turkish alphabet to an amazed population on 8 August 1928.<sup>137</sup> At the inauguration of the parliamentary year on 1 November following, Mustafa Kemal proclaimed that the Turkish people were about to enter a new age of enlightenment. Parliament subsequently accepted Law no. 1353, by means of which the use of the new script was made compulsory.<sup>138</sup> Together with these efforts, the government also attempted to purify (*tasfiye*) the Turkish language of Arabic and Persian additions. Republican sympathisers were unequivocal in their condemnation of these 'foreign' and openly Islamic elements in the Turkish language.<sup>139</sup> Underlying all these reforms was 'an extreme form' of Turkish nationalism, which according to Erik Zürcher was used as the 'primary instrument in the building of a new national identity to take the place of religion in many respects'.<sup>140</sup> In other words, one could say, Turkish nationalism was now meant to become the 'civic religion of the new state', to borrow Roger Chickering's eloquent phrase.<sup>141</sup> On 1 September 1930 the abolition of religious education in secondary schools was made compulsory as well.<sup>142</sup>

### The Ottoman Printing Press

In the context of this momentous reform policy, a book appeared which was to be highly influential in the framework of the conceptual appreciation of Damad İbrahim Paşa in the Republic. This was *Türk Matbaacılığı*, written by the journalist and history teacher Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek] on the occasion of the second centenary of the establishment of the printing press in Turkey.<sup>143</sup> Selim Nüzhet was the son of Mahmûd Celâleddin Bey, the founder of, among other publications, the periodical *Hazine-i Evrâk* and the newspaper *Ceride*. Together with his brother, the writer Abdülhak Şinâsî [Hisar], Selim Nüzhet was sent to Geneva for his higher education. Upon his return to İstanbul in 1921 he at first started working as a history teacher. After the proclamation of the Republic, he occupied the post of history and Turkish teacher at the prestigious Robert Koleji, a position he held for ten years (1923-33). In the following year (1934) he was appointed director of the *Basma Yazı ve Resimleri Derleme Müdürlüğü* (Directorate for the Collection of Printed Texts and Pictures), founded upon Mustafa Kemal's personal instigation. But at the same time, Selim Nüzhet also wrote prolifically for such newspapers and periodicals as *İleri* and *Yarın*. In the latter years of his life he concentrated on writing theatre criticism for the daily *Akşam*.<sup>144</sup>

In his *Türk Matbaacılığı*, one of the last books printed in the Ottoman alphabet, Selim Nüzhet points out that the year 1929 was to carry a double sig-



nificance, as it marked the anniversary of the printing press and the introduction of the new Turkish alphabet.<sup>145</sup> At the outset of his text, Selim Nüzhet describes the invention of the press in the West, and how it had led to an age of awakening, to a 'Renaissance'.<sup>146</sup> He firmly ascribes the progress achieved by the West to the invention of print, leaving the Islamic world behind, veiled in the 'darkness of ignorance and bigotry'.<sup>147</sup> Selim Nüzhet spends quite a number of pages talking about the development of print in the West,<sup>148</sup> but quickly turns his attention to Ahmed III, as his reign signalled the eventual arrival of 'symbols of awakening' in a Turkish context.<sup>149</sup> He then gives a positive assessment of Sultan Ahmed's reign:

The Treaty of Passarowitz, signed at the outset of Ahmed III's reign, brought an end to an era full of disaster. Peace and quiet reappeared and as a result, in the country scholarly activity became noticeable. From all these [developments] we can see that this age possessed a [set of] beliefs progressively widening, and that the people no longer possessed the power to thwart innovations with a blind bigotry.<sup>150</sup>

He mentions the translation committees that had been set up, as well as the libraries that had been founded, as indications of this 'scholarly activity'.<sup>151</sup> This positive account of the era is followed by the declaration that the period is generally referred to as the 'Tulip Age'.<sup>152</sup> The author immediately follows this statement with the observation that this denomination could give rise to the impression that the era had only been concerned with 'enjoyment and frivolity' (an apparent reference to such publications as Refik Ahmed [Sevengil]'s articles), which in his opinion would not be correct.<sup>153</sup> In a way quite reminiscent of Yahya Kemal's poetry, Selim Nüzhet even explicitly mentions that the 'taste' pervading İstanbul at the time had been of a rather Persianate colouring.<sup>154</sup> But turning his attention specifically to the issue of the printing press, Selim Nüzhet relates İbrahim Paşa's dispatch of Yirmisekiz Çelebi to Paris. The announcement of this mission is followed by a detailed appraisal of the Grand Vezir's underlying goals in sending an Ottoman to Paris:

It is well-known that one of the instructions Damad İbrahim Paşa gave to Mehmed Çelebi in 1719 (1132) was that "aside from his political services [he was] to make a thorough study of the means of civilization and education of France, and report on those capable of application". From the fact that such an instruction was given we can conclude that the movement of awakening which, as recorded above, had begun in this period had been well founded.<sup>155</sup>

This quotation blatantly reveals the agenda pursued by Selim Nüzhet, in the sense that the sentence creates the impression that the early eighteenth-century rulers of İstanbul had pursued a clearly defined programme of renewal, similar in many ways to the reforms and policies of the founders of the Republic.<sup>156</sup> The author states that it is ‘well-known’ (‘malûm’) that one of the instructions given by Damad İbrahim to Yirmisekiz Çelebi was to find out and describe France’s ‘means of civilisation and education’, ‘and report on those capable of application’. The following sentence then derives the inference that the current ‘movement of awakening’, which had been mentioned earlier, was ‘well-founded’.

The sentence containing Damad İbrahim’s instructions (‘talimât’) is placed within inverted commas (“aside from his political services . . .”), indicating a quotation. But no reference, containing a source, is given for the phrase. In the three pages following the ‘reproduction’ of the Damad’s instructions, Selim Nüzhet gives several quotations from Yirmisekiz Çelebi’s book, which he introduces at that stage of his text, calling it erroneously a *Seyâhatnâme*. The author states that he had ‘seen’ three different editions of Yirmisekiz Çelebi’s text: Suavî Efendi’s Paris edition (1872), the edition to be found among Ebüzziya’s works (‘külliyât’), and an old edition with no specific mention of the printing house. The latter edition proved to be the most complete, he remarks.<sup>157</sup>

### The Background to Damad İbrahim’s Instructions

An investigation of the sources available could provide an insight into the true nature of Selim Nüzhet’s rather controversial reproduction of Damad İbrahim’s instructions. The *Tarih*, compiled by the *vakaniüvis* Râşid Efendi (active 1126-35/1714-23), offers a good starting point. The *Tarih-i Râşid* contains an account of events from the year 1070/1660, which was the point at which Naimâ’s work stopped. The narrative was carried on till Şevvâl 1134/August 1722. The *Tarih-i Râşid* was printed on two occasions: the first edition appeared in 1153/1741, the second in 1282/1866.<sup>158</sup> In the nineteenth-century edition of the work the relevant pages appear in its fifth volume. Under the heading ‘Dispatch of an Ambassador in the Direction of France’, Râşid considers Mehmed Efendi’s mission at some length.<sup>159</sup> At the outset of this exposition the *vakaniüvis* mentions that the states of Europe, or rather the Christian states, continually kept themselves informed of each others’ movements and intentions as well as of the true state of their power and strength through correspondence and the dispatch of ambassadors.<sup>160</sup> Râşid continues that these Christian states kept themselves equally informed of the affairs of the Sublime State as a result of the continual dispatch of ambassadors to İstanbul. He then goes on to say

that the Grand Vezir Damad İbrahim therefore decided to send an envoy to France:

Mehmed Efendi better known as Yirmisekiz Çelebi, who had occupied the post of second plenipotentiary in the peace negotiations with Austria, was a man well and truly tested in the service of the Sublime State. Apart from this he was an experienced and well-informed person, who in the course of the above-mentioned [Passarowitz] negotiations had acquired knowledge about the conduct of discussions and the intrigues of the Christians. For [all] these reasons he was commissioned as ambassador to France by the Sultan . . .<sup>161</sup>

The eighteenth-century chronicler states that Mehmed Efendi had been a diligent servant of the Ottoman state ('hidemât-ı devlet-i aliyye') and a competent and shrewd man, well-versed ('tahsil-i ittilâ') in the intrigues of the Christians, as proven in his competent behaviour at the negotiations at Passarowitz. The Ottoman ambassador Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi was dispatched to Paris on 7 October 1720 and returned to İstanbul on 8 October 1721.<sup>162</sup> Mehmed Efendi wrote down a text detailing the particulars of his travels as well as an account of the observations he made in France. In doing so, Yirmisekiz Çelebi adhered to a literary tradition established in the second half of the seventeenth century. This report, a so-called 'Takrir', was published in the *Tarih-i Râşid*, prefaced by a paragraph relating the return of Yirmisekiz Çelebi.<sup>163</sup>

This edition of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's text appears to be the only eighteenth-century version available. Selim Nüzhet's acknowledgment of the fact that Ali Suavi had prepared an edition of the *Takrir* during his stay in Paris appears very significant. Ali Suavi had spent the period 1867-76 in Paris, having fled Ottoman persecution. He arrived in Paris in the company of Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa. These writers, part of the movement known as Young Ottomans (*Yeni Osmanlılar*) (1865-76), were 'familiar with Western representative institutions and impatient with the pace of the Tanzimat', as phrased by Stanford Shaw.<sup>164</sup> The figure of Ali Suavi is of a complex nature however. The historian of Ottoman intellectual life, Şerif Mardin, describes him as a 'charlatan' and a 'rank'.<sup>165</sup> In Paris, Ali Suavi had been active writing first in the newspaper *Muhbir*, and then publishing the periodical *Ulûm*.<sup>166</sup> In 1872 he published Yirmisekiz Çelebi's text in Ottoman under the French title *Tacryr ou relation de Mohammed Effendi* (48 pp.), appending a preface in French as well as one in Ottoman.<sup>167</sup> In the French preface Ali Suavi talks about Yirmisekiz Çelebi's mission in terms of the Ottomans' desire to conclude an armistice with the Knights of Malta employing French mediation.<sup>168</sup> The remainder of the pre-

amble consists of lengthy quotations from Hammer's *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*.<sup>169</sup> The Ottoman preface, on the other hand, contains an interesting assessment of Damad İbrahim's tenure as Grand Vezir and his attempts at improving conditions in the Ottoman sphere (İstanbul):

The time of Damad İbrahim Paşa's sadâret was İstanbul's most brilliant time in the literary arts. With his encouragement and patronage many books were translated into Turkish and numerous libraries were established. Together with his aim of furthering the internal [level of] learning, he wanted to make İstanbul aware of the current achievements and knowledge in France, and with this object of obtaining information on French learning, he dispatched Defterdar Mehmed Efendi to Paris as ambassador extraordinary in the time of Louis XV.<sup>170</sup>

Ali Suavi pronounces a programmatic statement indicating Damad İbrahim's far-reaching policy aims in despatching an ambassador to Paris. He states that the Grand Vezir had wanted to benefit from the French achievements in the fields of learning and education. In order to become informed of these important accomplishments, Ali Suavi remarks, he dispatched Mehmed Efendi to the Paris of Louis XV (1722-74).

Ali Suavi ends this assessment of Damad İbrahim's diplomatic programmes regarding France with a rather matter of fact pronouncement that the establishment of a printing press in İstanbul was 'entirely' the outcome of this embassy.<sup>171</sup> Ali Suavi takes the establishment of the press to infer that Damad İbrahim, as the patron of the mission, had given Yirmisekiz Çelebi a specific charge:

Çelebizâde Mehmed Efendi, better known under his nickname Yirmisekiz, was plenipotentiary at [the negotiations for] the Treaty of Passarowitz in 1130, and two years later he was appointed ambassador extraordinary to Paris. The oral instructions given to him by İbrahim Paşa were concerned with the matter of observing the fortified places of France, its factories and its instances of prosperity, and writing a report on everything he had seen.<sup>172</sup>

Ali Suavi's words seem to lie at the root of Selim Nüzhet's self-assured proclamation of Damad İbrahim's set of instructions. Suavi mistakenly identifies Mehmed Efendi as 'Çelebizâde'. In a rather circular fashion Ali Suavi infers that the Grand Vezir had 'orally instructed' the ambassador to 'observe' France's 'fortified positions', its manufactures, (employing the anachronistic term 'factories' in this instance), and its general level of 'prosperity' so as to then be able

to record all that he seen in a 'written report'. In other words, Ali Suavi seems to have felt the need to explain the reasons behind the existence of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's book, unaware of the tradition of compiling such reports in the Ottoman Empire.

### **Damad İbrahim's Instructions Revisited**

It has been established that Ottoman diplomatic missions and regulations prior to Selim III (1789-1807) had been conducted without the use of written instructions.<sup>173</sup> Selim Nüzhet, on the other hand, creates the impression that he was directly quoting from an eighteenth-century source. The preface to the nineteenth-century edition of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's book by the colourful Ali Suavi contains a phrase relating instructions given by Damad İbrahim. Suavi stresses the fact that these instructions had been given orally. As a result, it would appear that Selim Nüzhet had taken over the idea of a special set of instructions from Ali Suavi, attested by his mention that this was a well-known fact. It could thus be argued that certain individual words, such as 'hidemât' and 'ittulâ', used by Râşid Efendi could have induced Selim Nüzhet, in a rather journalistic manner, to fabricate 'one of the instructions' given to the Ottoman ambassador that had been hinted at by Ali Suavi 56 years earlier. The lines found in *Türk Matbaacılığı* appear in a pseudo-Ottoman language that could have been used by the Grand Vezir. But in view of the oral nature of Ottoman diplomacy prior to Selim III's reforms, it seems certain that both Ali Suavi and Selim Nüzhet made up a set of instructions to suit their individual agendas. Ali Suavi had apparently felt the need to explain the reasoning behind the *Takrir*'s existence as mentioned above. Selim Nüzhet, on the other hand, goes a step further by adding the crucial phrase 'kâbil-i tatbik' ('capable of application') to the set of instructions appearing in his book. Future generations of historians and writers have taken Selim Nüzhet's words at face-value, believing them to have been authentic pronouncements of the Grand Vezir Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim Paşa, proving his commitment to effective Westernisation.

A closer look at Yirmisekiz Çelebi's book reveals further the problematic nature of the 'instructions' given by Damad İbrahim. The first *Sefâretnâme*, as these reports were subsequently called by Ottoman publishers, is the one written by Kara Mehmed Paşa sent to Vienna in 1075/1665. This mission had taken place in the context of the signature of the Treaty of Vasvár (10 August 1664) between the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires.<sup>174</sup> The literary genre was kept in use until Selim III's introduction of permanent embassies with Yusuf Ağâh Efendi's mission to London on 21 December 1793.<sup>175</sup> The historian Faik Reşid Unat made a very well-respected study of the genre, *Osmanlı Sefirleri ve Sefâretnâmeleri*. This thorough examination, however, was only published

posthumously by Bekir Sıtkı Baykal in 1968. The work contains a wealth of information on Yirmisekiz Çelebi and his *Sefâretnâme*.<sup>176</sup> In accord with Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek]'s statements, Unat also mentions that Ali Suavi had edited the text during his stay in Paris (1867-76), entitling it *Takrir* conforming to Râşid's edition. Unat adds that Suavi had also supplied the book with a preface written in Turkish and in French.<sup>177</sup> He also relates that Ebüzziya Tevfik had published an edition, entitled *Paris Sefâretnâmesi*, printed in 1306/1888-89.<sup>178</sup> In addition, Unat mentions that Yirmisekiz Çelebi's text was reproduced in the fifth volume of the *Tarih-i Râşid*.<sup>179</sup> And finally, he notes the existence of a separate edition of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's book, printed by the Matbaa-ı İlmiyye-i Osmaniyye in 1283/1866.<sup>180</sup>

In contrast to Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek], Unat does not refer to an 'old' edition containing the 'most complete' version of the text. Instead he points to an eighteenth-century edition of the book in French, translated by Jean-Claude Galland.<sup>181</sup> Fatma Müge Göçek, writing in the late 1980s, for her part, mentions seven printed and twelve manuscript versions of the *Sefâretnâme* in her study on Yirmisekiz Çelebi and his impact on Ottoman society.<sup>182</sup> The way in which Selim Nüzhet had organised his *Türk Matbaacılığı* makes a clear differentiation between Damad İbrahim's instructions and Mehmed Efendi's report, asserting that the former were 'well-known'. Looking at the actual text of the *Sefâretnâme*, one sees that Yirmisekiz Çelebi had written a detailed report of his embassy, beginning with a *bismele*, followed by an invocation of God and the Prophet Muhammed, and then proceeding directly to a factual account of his trip. The ambassador's book is full of descriptions of exotic aspects of France and French life unknown to Ottoman readers, in particular to the Sultan and his Grand Vezir, the report's primary target audience. But nevertheless, Selim Nüzhet's relation of Damad İbrahim's 'instructions' has led to the emergence of certain preconceptions in the minds of readers of the *Sefâretnâme*. Even the fastidious Faik Reşid Unat mentions that Yirmisekiz Çelebi had received a special brief for his trip to Paris, even though his actual entry on the *Sefâretnâme* does not contain a reference to Damad İbrahim's instructions.<sup>183</sup> Selim Nüzhet's obscure allusion to Damad İbrahim's new policy of approaching the West, as contained in the wording of one of his supposed 'instructions' to Yirmisekiz Çelebi was to have a lasting effect on writers dealing with Ahmed III in the coming decades.

### A 'Renaissance' in Turkey

At the outset of *Türk Matbaacılığı* Selim Nüzhet's contention that the introduction of the printing press is to be held responsible for an awakening in the arts and sciences, such as witnessed in the sixteenth-century European Renaissance,

would seem to indicate that he interprets Ahmed III's reign and Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* in a similar vein. Ahmed Refik earlier stressed the fact that Yirmisekiz Çelebi had functioned as the intermediary between early eighteenth-century İstanbul (1718-30) and *régence* France (1715-23).<sup>184</sup> In his book published to commemorate the bi-centenary of the introduction of the printing press in 'Turkey', Selim Nüzhet takes this stance to its logical conclusion presenting Damad İbrahim Paşa as the pre-eminent champion of an Ottoman, or rather Turkish, awakening at the time. The author discloses his appreciation of the Grand Vezir in his grisly account of the effects of the Patrona Halil rebellion: '[t]he most important patron of print and progress İbrahim Paşa was also hacked to pieces'.<sup>185</sup> This sentence relating the gruesome end of the Damad's life recalls Imre Karacsón's appraisal, including the mention of the term 'teced-üd' ('renewal' or 'Renaissance').<sup>186</sup> The author portrays the rebels as savage ruffians, but records that, rather surprisingly, they had not destroyed the printing press, the agent of civilised change.<sup>187</sup>

Selim Nüzhet's book marks an interesting moment in the Republican understanding of the phrase 'Tulip Age'. The books published by the *Maarif Vekâleti* show that the intellectual establishment of the early Republic was not favourably inclined towards either Damad İbrahim or Ahmed Refik's interpretation of a 'Tulip Age'. Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin expressed their doubts as to the validity of Ahmed Refik's re-interpretation of Ahmed Cevdet's image of Damad İbrahim as a sybarite. Ali Canib [Yöntem] in his *Hayat* article voiced a different appraisal, an assessment which seems to be in line with the account found in Abdurrahman Şeref's school-book *Fezleke* (1315/1897-98), written for use in the secondary educational system, the so-called *İdâdiyye*. Ali Canib had finished his secondary schooling in 1906 and while a school-boy could thus have come in contact with the textbook, and its special words of praise for Damad İbrahim.<sup>188</sup> Selim Nüzhet, on the other hand, appropriates wholeheartedly Ahmed Refik's stance, including his additions to the original *Lâle Devri* in the nationalist *Yeni Mecmûa*.<sup>189</sup> As a writer with a particular interest in the issue of the printing press, he recognises Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* as worthy of further scrutiny. As he is concerned solely with the issue of the printing press, he feels that İbrahim Paşa's patronage had been nothing short of enlightening and progressive. Selim Nüzhet adopts not only Ahmed Refik's stance but also Imre Karacsón's positive reading of İbrahim Paşa's term of office as having been highly beneficial to the cause of the 'Hungarian convert' İbrahim Müteferrika Efendi.<sup>190</sup>

As a result, Selim Nüzhet's *Türk Matbaacılığı* stands out as a somewhat shrill voice in the corpus of early Republican history-writing relating to the reign of Ahmed III. In the face of the opposition of the Ministry of Education, the text valiantly takes up the cause of the 'Tulip Age' as the beginning of a 'Renaissance',

or rather 'awakening' (corresponding to the Ottoman term 'intibâh'), in a Turkish context. The historian Necip Asım [Yazıksız] wrote a review of the book at the end of the following year (September-October 1929).<sup>191</sup> The review is extremely positive about the book's value and timeliness in view of Turkey's aspired entry into the fold of the civilised world at the time. Necip Asım dwells on Selim Nüzhet's view that the emergence of the 'Renaissance', or 'age of rebirth', as he calls it, and the invention of the printing press are inter-connected. He puts forward his personal contention that the Ottoman scholar Kâtib Çelebi and the vezir Damad İbrahim Paşa are responsible for the 'rebirth of the Turks'.<sup>192</sup> Whereas he views Kâtib Çelebi's case as self-explanatory,<sup>193</sup> Necip Asım asserts that an 'impartial critic' willing to engage with the case of Damad İbrahim will vindicate his interpretive suggestion.<sup>194</sup>

### Ahmed Refik and İbrahim Hilmi

In the same year (1929), İbrahim Hilmi published a textbook on medieval and modern history, *Çocuklara Tarih Bilgisi*, designed for use in primary school education in the new Turkish alphabet.<sup>195</sup> Significantly, it was written by the disgraced chairman of the *TTE*, Ahmed Refik. In the book's preamble he deals with ancient times, mentioning the civilisations of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Phoenicians and Hittites.<sup>196</sup> In dealing with the Middle Ages, Ahmed Refik describes the Turks as follows: '[t]hey were a powerful nation in Asia, they advanced in civilization. They Turkified Anatolia'.<sup>197</sup> The author divides the little school-book into five sections, the largest of which deals with the Ottomans.<sup>198</sup> He includes an account of Ahmed III and his Grand Vezir Damad İbrahim, without, however, mentioning the phrase 'Lâle Devri'. He gives the verdict that the Patrona Halil rebellion had been instigated by the Damad's enemies, who destroyed his beneficial works.<sup>199</sup> He ends his exposé on the Ottoman centuries with an account of the First World War.<sup>200</sup>

In the same year, the champion of the 'Tulip Age' Ahmed Refik, produced another school-book as the first volume in the 'Çocukların Tarih Kitabı Serisi' promulgated by the Ministry of Education, significantly detailing the introduction of the printing press in 'Turkey'.<sup>201</sup> The slim booklet, *İlk Türk Matbaası*, takes a broad view of the subject, beginning with an account of Johannes Gutenberg, before dealing with Müteferrika and Mehmed Said Efendi.<sup>202</sup> Ahmed Refik underlines the rift between the progressive West and the Ottomans created by Gutenberg, firmly placing it in the context of the conquest of Constantinople (1453), rather than just mentioning that this event had taken place in Fatih's reign (1451-81).<sup>203</sup> The school-book presents Yirmisekiz Çelebi's embassy as having been instrumental in familiarising the Ottomans with the idea of mechanically reproducing books.



Following this introduction the author sets out to promote the figure of Damad İbrahim as a far-sighted Grand Vezir who tried to modernise the antiquated Ottoman Empire, so that the Turks would also achieve the progress which had already been attained by Europe:

The Grand Vezir İbrahim Paşa was very pleased with the opening of the printing press. His idea was this: what has destroyed the Turks is ignorance. The Turks are always fighting wars, so that no time is left for reading or writing. The people are never at ease. War is always harmful. For this reason schools should be opened, the people should read, they should get some peace. The Turks should progress like the Europeans.<sup>204</sup>

Ahmed Refik employs this little school text to hint at a parallel between the 1920s and the 1720s. He presents Damad İbrahim as an enlightened statesman, who tried to introduce the principle of progress into the stagnant Ottoman system. But he ends this narrative by indicating that the goodwill and intelligence present in the eighteenth-century leadership was not appreciated by Ahmed III's contemporaries. For Ahmed Refik, Damad İbrahim was a rare intellect ahead of his time and society. The populace was not able to understand the vezir and his actions, as those who opposed him had been steeped in ignorance.<sup>205</sup> In the booklet's final lines, the author capitalises on the supposed parallels with the current situation. He pronounces that the previous generations had experienced great difficulties learning the Ottoman alphabet, as it was so obviously unsuited to the Turkish language. Ahmed Refik ends the paragraph with the alphabet reform, and presents Mustafa Kemal as the genius who saved the Turkish population from Ottoman ignorance.<sup>206</sup> Thus the unspoken parallelism that had been developed in the booklet is spelled out on the final page. Mustafa Kemal succeeded in closing the gap separating Turkey from Europe, an exercise Damad İbrahim had not been able to achieve two centuries earlier.

The most interesting aspect of this propagandistic school-book and the medieval and modern history textbook *Çocuklara Tarih Bilgisi* is the fact that these books deal with the reign of Ahmed III and the administration of Damad İbrahim without mentioning the phrase 'Lâle Devri'. Ahmed Refik reiterates the progressive atmosphere pervading the 1720s, but chooses not to employ the term which he had launched in his 1913 monograph. Other historians active at the same time, such as Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin, readily acknowledged the existence of the term. It seems plausible that Ahmed Refik's text avoids employing the phrase in

school textbooks as a result of the moral opprobrium attached to the Damad's tulip festivities. As a result, Celâl Esad [Arseven]'s *Türk Sanatı*, Ali Canib [Yöntem]'s article in *Hayat* and Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek]'s *Türk Matbaacılığı* stand out as the only texts printed in the 1920s to take up the cause of the 'Tulip Age' as a new beginning.



## Chapter II/2

# The Subterranean Survival of the 'Tulip Age', 1930-38

With a great movement of awakening reminiscent of the Renaissance, the nation has thrown away the old culture and has begun to climb towards a new, living culture in life, art, and the entire world of ideas . . . While changing its culture today, the Turkish nation is completely preserving the racial and permanent essence peculiar to itself. It can even be said that the nation is finding itself more [completely] today

Hasan Cemil [Çambel], 'Hars Tebdili' (1929)\*

### A New Renaissance

At the close of the 1920s, the historian and personal friend of Mustafa Kemal Paşa, Hasan Cemil [Çambel], summarised the developments taking place under the Republic's aegis in the above-quoted eloquent way, employing the title 'Hars Tebdili' ('Change of Culture'). Hasan Cemil's statement implicitly claims modernisation as Westernisation to be a necessary means to an all-Turkish end. The adoption of a new (i.e. European) culture ('hars') is presented as a radical modernisation constituting a bold leap forward into the contemporary world. Hasan Cemil's usage of the term 'Renaissance' ('rönesans') in this context should be understood as more than simply florid language. By this stage, Burkhardt's views and Friedrich Nietzsche's particular understanding of the term Renaissance, as a new terminology, a terminology indicative of progress and change, were well known in Republican Turkey.

An article written by Ali Canib [Yöntem] at the end of the crucial year 1926, when the last personal ties with the Ottomans were severed through a series of 'political show trials',<sup>1</sup> illustrates this vividly. The article was published in the periodical *Hayat*, carrying the rather significant title 'Rönesans ve Türkiye'. In it, Ali Canib outlines the discourse of modernism and progress associated with the term.<sup>2</sup> Ali Canib describes how progress in Europe had been hampered by

a religiously motivated way of thinking during the Middle Ages. He then optimistically proclaims that Europe was saved from this disastrous system by the Renaissance.<sup>3</sup> Following the religiously-inspired world of the Middle Ages, he claims that the Renaissance saw the emergence of people whose preoccupations were of a distinctly non-religious nature ('lâdinî').<sup>4</sup> Ali Canib's words demonstrate the way in which Turkish intellectuals seem to have interpreted the term 'Renaissance' as synonymous with progress, modernity and arguably even secularism. Throughout the 1930s and beyond, Turkish intellectuals were ready to employ the term 'Renaissance' to serve their own agenda. The philosopher and art historian Mazhar Şevket İpşir[oğlu], for instance, tried to popularise the term through the network of lectures organised by the CHP (Republican People's Party) in the 1930s.<sup>5</sup> Mazhar Şevket also squarely posits the religious nature of the '[t]he middle ages'.<sup>6</sup> Referring to Burckhardt, he then declares that during the Renaissance a new type of 'human will' emerged, a man liberated from the bonds of religious control and instead inclined towards nature.<sup>7</sup> He then declares that the term 'Renaissance' means nothing less than the beginning of a new world order.<sup>8</sup> Mazhar Şevket's words indicate that Turkish intellectuals at the time thought that this new order remained valid up to the present day.<sup>9</sup>

As a result, one can interpret Hasan Cemil's above-quoted usage of the term 'rönesans' as not just simply implying that the Turkish nation was going through a phase of renewal. He seems to say that this renewal constituted nothing less than the Europeanisation of Turkey. Hasan Cemil's statement succinctly reveals how the modernisation of the Turkish nation through the adoption of a new [European] culture ('hars') was presented as a matter of national pride and self-attainment. This process of Turkish self-realisation was known at the time as a 'Renaissance'. This way of reasoning appears very similar to Ahmed Refik's interpretation of the latter part of the reign of Ahmed III as a 'Renaissance in Turkey', published in 1918.<sup>10</sup>

### The Ottoman Legacy<sup>11</sup>

In spite of the fact that contemporaries interpreted the Republic as the beginning of a 'Turkish Renaissance', unconnected with its Ottoman predecessor, on a practical level the government continued to support certain inheritances from the Ottoman Empire. The important task of the historiographical representation of Turkey, for instance, was still executed by the *TTE*, the successor of the *TOE*. In the first years of the decade the *TTE* even published a number of collections of Ottoman archival documents, compiled by Ahmed Refik.<sup>12</sup> Throughout the latter part of the 1920s the Ministry of Education lent its financial and institutional support to the *TTE*. But by 1932, this lenient attitude changed. Akbayrak mentions that '[t]he budget of 1932 no longer included an

allocation of funds for the [Turkish History] Society'.<sup>13</sup> The Republic's new-found nationalistic fervour for the production of history meant that the conservative agenda observed by the *TTE* no longer proved sufficient to satisfy the government's need for new ground-breaking research. As formulated by Erik Zürcher, the articulation of Turkish nationalism under Mustafa Kemal involved the 'creation of historical myths'.<sup>14</sup> In accordance with these 'myths', Turkish history was to receive a teleological reinterpretation at the hands of the Republican establishment. This new understanding of history was to shift public attention to the pre-Ottoman period in the course of the 1930s and beyond. In order to produce such 'myths' a new research policy needed to be developed, a policy the *TTE* was apparently not willing to engage.

In the first years of the Republic's existence Dr. Rıza Nûr had already attempted to construct a more manageable past in his government-sponsored multi-volume *Türk Tarihi*. In its third tome, Rıza Nûr calls Turkey the 'child and heir' of the Seljuks.<sup>15</sup> The book drives home the point so as to leave no doubt in his readers' minds about its message: '[i]n other words, the nation is still the same nation, the state is still the same state'.<sup>16</sup> Dr. Nûr thus connects the Republic of Turkey directly with its Seljuk forebear, the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum (1077-1243), conveniently bypassing the intervening Ottoman era (1299-1922). Dr. Nûr's text suggests the Seljuks' intimate connection with the Anatolian soil, even hinting at the fact that the actual shape of the Republic coincided with the territories of the Seljuk state of Konya. On the other hand, the fact that the Seljuks were also part of the Turks' Islamic heritage must have made them unattractive to the Kemalist establishment that wanted to separate Turkish cultural identity completely from the wider Islamic world. As put by Hülya Küçük, the Kemalists did not 'oppose Islam as a faith, but condemned its dogmatism and supposedly inherent opposition to technical and social progress'.<sup>17</sup>

### Developing the Turkish History Thesis

In order to fully appreciate the ramifications of the Kemalist understanding of history, it seems necessary to investigate the development of the officially approved historiographical activity during the 1930s in some detail. The mindset of the historians engaged in this new appreciation of Turkish history reflected the government's stance on issues of historical culture and Turkey's relationship with Islam and the Ottomans, and thus necessarily with Ahmed III as well.<sup>18</sup>

Mustafa Kemal Paşa's personal involvement was of crucial importance in this instance. The contemporary historian and close personal friend of Mustafa Kemal, Âfet İnan, recounts that the impetus the Republic's president needed to devote his full attention to the matter of history and historiography had been

the realisation of the racist relegation of the Turks to a secondary stage in human development by French and other European specialists.<sup>19</sup>

On 23 April 1930, during the sixth congress of the *Türk Ocakları*, an organisation inherited from the previous régime,<sup>20</sup> Âfet Hanım, as well as other members, proposed the establishment of a committee for the scientific study of Turkish culture and history.<sup>21</sup> As a result, the Committee for Research on Turkish History (*Türk Tarihi Tetkik Heyeti*) was founded, comprised of sixteen members. Upon Mustafa Kemal's personal instigation these researchers then developed the so-called *Türk Tarih Tezi* (Turkish History Thesis), which was published in a massive tome, entitled *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları*.<sup>22</sup> In 1931 the Ministry of Education published the book's introductory part as a brochure (*Methal Kısmı*).<sup>23</sup> Mete Tunçay correctly indicates that the History Thesis relied heavily on the book *Pontus Meselesi* (1922). In actual fact, the *Ana Hatları*'s primary source appears to have been the *Mukaddime* ('Preface') to the work *Pontus Meselesi*, written by Ağaoglu Ahmed Bey, a former Young Turk of Azeri extraction who was to become an important figure in Kemalist circles.<sup>24</sup>

The authors of the *Ana Hatları* expound upon the fact that Central Asia had been the original homeland ('Ana-Yurdu') of the Turkish race, a notion current in the Ottoman lands since the appearance of Ahmed Vefik's *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Osmaniyye* (1286/1869).<sup>25</sup> The *Ana Hatları* even states that, while the rest of the world was still enveloped in an intensely primitive life, the ancestors of the Turkish race had already attained a higher level. Quite literally the book claims Central Asia to have been the place of origin of human civilisation: '[t]he era which separates humanity from bestiality in a true and obvious sense . . . started here'.<sup>26</sup> From here, according to the *Ana Hatları*, the Turkish race had been moving westward, in regular migratory waves across thousands of years, civilising the rest of the world in the process.<sup>27</sup> The book places the Republic's direct ancestors, the Ottomans and the Seljuks, on an equal footing with the bronze age inhabitants of Anatolia, the Hittites:

The state[s] they [the Turkish migrants] founded, such as the Hittite, Seljuk, and Ottoman states, would be known by the name of the tribe or family that was the most powerful and that exercised government.<sup>28</sup>

The *Ana Hatları* gives an account of the various states established by the Turks in Central Asia, culminating in their mass conversion to Islam in 963.<sup>29</sup> The book comments that in the further course of history the Turks contributed considerably to the development and dissemination of Islamic civilisation, which received the erroneous denomination 'Arab civilisation'.<sup>30</sup> But the main thrust of the *Ana Hatları* is not concerned with Islam. Instead the work focuses attention on excavations in Mesopotamia that had uncovered the material re-

mains of the ancient civilisations of Sumer and Elam, which the work claims were of Central Asian origin.<sup>31</sup> The beginning of the Turkish migrations, championed by the *Ana Hatları*, is placed at the remote date 8,000 BC.<sup>32</sup> The book thus connects the ancient Turkish civilisation with the Anatolian Turks, whom the authors refer to as Ottoman Turks.<sup>33</sup> The tome originally printed in 1930 did not satisfy the Kemalist leadership. Instead three series of so-called drafts ('müsvedde') were published in the years 1932, 1934 and 1936. The majority of these publications relate the details of the History Thesis, but at the same time numerous booklets also deal with either the Turks' Islamic past or even the Ottomans.<sup>34</sup>

In early April 1931 the organisation of the *Türk Ocakları* was closed.<sup>35</sup> At the end of an extraordinary Congress of the *Türk Ocakları*, held on 10 April, its chairman Hamdullah Suphi [Tanrıöver] supervised its dissolution. Its closure signaled the government's intention to exercise a tighter control over the various institutions promulgating Republican thought, as indicated by François Georjeon.<sup>36</sup> This closure led to the establishment of the Society for Research on Turkish History or *Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti (TTTC)* on 15 April 1931. This establishment was thus attached directly to the government and the figure of Mustafa Kemal, without interference from any intermediary grouping that could have shaped the institution's research agenda. A year after its foundation, the TTTC in conjunction with the Ministry of Education (*Maarif Vekâleti*), organised the First Turkish History Congress, between 2-11 June 1932 in the Ankara People's House (*Halkevi*). The proceedings were subsequently published as *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*.<sup>37</sup>

### The First Turkish History Congress

The congress was organised for the benefit of both academics and school-teachers. Mustafa Kemal was closely involved in this effort to teach the nation the 'true national history' of Turkey.<sup>38</sup> The government employed this gathering as a means to promulgate the new History Thesis. The published congress proceedings, *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*, stand out as a manifesto of the Kemalist understanding of Turkish history. The then Minister of Education, Esat [Sagay],<sup>39</sup> made the opening speech, in which he puts forward the main thrust of the Thesis, while also hinting at the research done in connection with the Turkish language, which had established its 'world-wide' importance.<sup>40</sup> After considering the stagnation and decline of the Ottomans, Esat Bey concludes by stating that the brand-new and vigorous Republic of Turkey had taken the place of the disintegrating Ottoman Empire.<sup>41</sup>

Following this speech, the young and enthusiastic Âfet [İnan] gave a lecture on prehistory and the dawn of history, in which she resolutely proclaims the



civilising characteristics of the Turkish race, calling Central Asia the 'cradle of civilisation'.<sup>42</sup> She asserts that the Turks in Central Asia had been the bearers of a high culture from at least 9,000 BC.<sup>43</sup> Âfet Hanım furthermore declares that the Turks belonged to the white and brachycephalic race and had carried their language with them across the world.<sup>44</sup> The fact that this key-note lecture was delivered by a 24-year-old woman is of particular importance. Âfet Hanım acted as Mustafa Kemal's personal spokesperson during the Congress. She presented the History Thesis, developed upon the President's personal instigation and encouragement. At the same time, the fact that Mustafa Kemal had delegated the task of publicly announcing the government's 'new' stance on historical culture to a young woman discloses the importance the Republican establishment allotted to the principle of the equality of the sexes. During the Constitutional period (1908-18) the issue of the emancipation of women was a public debate that at times even entered the historical discourse developed at the time.<sup>45</sup> In the Republic, women were granted civil rights in 1930 and universal suffrage was declared in 1934.<sup>46</sup> Even today, numerous women in Turkey praise Mustafa Kemal as the one who saved their sex from the restrictions of Islam and Ottoman bigotry. But Mustafa Kemal's gesture also displayed the rather paternalistic approach taken by the Republic and the CHP to furthering the cause of women and feminism.<sup>47</sup> The young woman faced a crowd of mostly middle-aged men, whose scholarly interest must have undoubtedly been titillated by the sight of a nubile female declaring the Turks to have fertilised the barren lands of the prehistoric world. It can thus be suggested that the government's choice of Âfet [İnan] to deliver the speech was a cunning public relations exercise.

The great discovery of the Congress was the ancient nature of the Turkish race, as can be read in *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*. In his contribution, Hasan Cemil [Çambel], for instance, speaks of the fact that Aegean society had already in prehistoric times exhibited the appearance of East Asian civilisation.<sup>48</sup> In his view this fact that could not simply be explained by means of commercial contacts and exchanges.<sup>49</sup> Yusuf Ziya [Ortaç], for his part, concludes that ancient Egypt's creed had also been of Turkish origin and that Egyptian deities even carried Turkish names.<sup>50</sup> Reşit Galip then proclaims that the ancient Hittites ('Eti') in Anatolia belonged to the Turkish race.<sup>51</sup> The contributors to the Congress were well aware of claims that the Hittite language belongs to the Indo-Germanic language group, first published by Knudtzon and Hrozný in the 1910s, but dismiss them as deceptive. The Professor of the 'Ancient Peoples of the East', Avram Galanti [Bodrumlu], mentions the theses put forward by Western specialists in his lecture criticising the four-volume *Tarih* prepared by the *TTTC*.<sup>52</sup> But Samih Rifat counters Avram Galanti's assertions by stating that Hrozný had not translated the true Hittite language but rather a later language.<sup>53</sup>

The *TTTC*'s pronouncements were an indirect attack on the figure of Ahmed Refik. The champion of the 'Tulip Age' was also present at the Congress. The subsequently published proceedings even list Ahmed Refik as a member of the *TTTC*.<sup>54</sup> The claims relating to the Turkishness of the Hittites contradict the views he propounded in 1926. His school textbook *Umûmî Tarih* quite openly disputes assertions that the Hittites belonged to the Turanian or Turkish race.<sup>55</sup> Ahmed Refik's views are based on Hrozny's decipherment of the cuneiform tablets as constituting an hitherto unknown 'Indo-Germanic' language. As a result, the erstwhile chairman of the *TTE* unwittingly became an opponent of Turkey's new line on history and historiography, in spite of his own support for the 'nationalist' cause.

### Ahmed Refik at the Congress

On the final day of the Congress, 11 July 1932, Akçuraoğlu Yusuf, who became known as Yusuf Akçura later on, delivered an interesting lecture dealing with the methodology of history-writing and the teaching of history.<sup>56</sup> This lecture was to have serious repercussions on Ahmed Refik, as the foremost representative of the old school of history-writing. In the *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi* one can read that Akçuraoğlu Yusuf asserts the social character of the discipline of history, and society's influence on historians.<sup>57</sup> Akçura is very critical of historians active in the Ottoman Empire. He distinguishes between a pre- and a post-*Tanzimat* era in the composition of historical narratives. Akçura condemns the pre-*Tanzimat* historians as slavish imitators of the Islamic tradition, which he describes as totally inward-focused, as deeming only the history of Islam worthy of exploration. He is positive about the beneficial effects of the *Tanzimat* reforms on the discipline of historiography, as it secured the introduction of Western historical methodology.<sup>58</sup> But then he mentions the negative effects of the Hamidian era (1876-1909) on any kind of intellectual activity. The era's strict censorship stifled any impartial engagement with history and made the publication of even-handed historical narratives near-impossible.<sup>59</sup> He points out that at the outset of the twentieth century the Hamidian system prescribed that history teaching be confined to Ottoman history, ignoring developments outside the Sultan's sphere of influence.<sup>60</sup> Following this assessment, Akçuraoğlu makes an insightful remark well worth quoting in full:

With the proclamation of the Meşrutiyet [Constitution] this history fast ("oruc") was suddenly broken. The numbers of those writing history and publishing history increased greatly. These historians were mostly translators of French history books, particularly of [the works of Charles]

Seignobos. As a witty friend of mine observed, “with the Meşrutiyet, a reign of Seignobos commenced in Ottoman schools”. I don’t see any need to cite examples to explain and prove this. All of you know this just as well as I do, maybe even better.<sup>61</sup>

As a final remark on this issue Yusuf Akçura adds:

... the majority of the history books we had available to us until yesterday as textbooks, through the recommendation of the Ministry of Education, are works composed in this way.<sup>62</sup>

Akçuraoğlu Yusuf in this way indirectly accuses the historian Ahmed Refik of excessive and uncritical reliance on French sources. Ahmed Refik’s *Tarih-i Umûmî* was revised under the Ministry of Education’s auspices to supply the younger generations of the Republic with a history textbook. Akçuraoğlu’s lecture praises the virtues of nationalism or Kemalism, which he considers absent from the work of the historians active in the Second Constitutional Era. Akçuraoğlu Yusuf effectively accuses Ahmed Refik of being an individual who lacked the nationalist fervour befitting historians writing under the Republic’s aegis. Yusuf Akçura’s criticism of the methodological weaknesses of the historians active in the previous era must have caused considerable embarrassment to Ahmed Refik.

Following the lecture, the chairman of the session, Esat [Sagay], gave Ahmed Refik the opportunity to reply, introducing him as a member of the *TTTC*:

I accept with grace the criticisms of our history books voiced in the lecture of my esteemed colleague Akçuraoğlu Yusuf Beyefendi. I know that my own books have not been liberated from the defects that have been indicated. In my new work I shall attempt to make good the point that I see to have been deficient in all of my works to date, so as to enlighten our children and our dear nation. I shall correct completely all the interpretative mistakes that occurred in my old works. Maybe then, and only after such an action, will I see the life that I have dedicated to my nation. (Applause).<sup>63</sup>

The fact that Ahmed Refik was a personal admirer of Charles Seignobos’ oeuvre is mentioned in earlier chapters. One could argue that Akçuraoğlu Yusuf accuses Ahmed Refik of committing an anti-nationalist act by uncritically copying European sources, implying that his school textbook was a mere translation of the work of the Frenchman Seignobos. This lecture delivered a deadly blow to Ahmed Refik’s already tarnished reputation.<sup>64</sup> At the Congress the field of an-

cient history was allotted primary importance. The type of historiography practised by Ahmed Refik did not just possess a weak voice at this gathering; Ottoman historiography was effectively silenced at this First Turkish History Congress in 1932. The cream of the Kemalist intelligentsia set out to discredit the Ottomans, and attempted to shift the general focus of attention to ancient history and to the Hittites, in accordance with the newly formulated History Thesis.

### **The Kemalist View of the Ottoman Demise**

But there were also voices dealing with more recent history at the Congress. Yusuf Hikmet [Bayur's] piece, for instance, reflects on the importance of the early eighteenth century, a time-frame roughly equivalent to the 'Tulip Age'. His piece proposes that the underlying reasons for the West's military, scientific and economic successes were of a purely religious and social nature.<sup>65</sup> These factors, together with the unexpected outcome of the voyages of discovery undertaken throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, brought Europe to the fore, leaving the Ottomans and the whole of the world of Islam behind. Further, he argues that the long wars with the Third Holy League following the second siege of Vienna (1683-99) exposed the inherent weakness of the Ottoman system to 'Turkish' observers in the Empire at the outset of the eighteenth century.<sup>66</sup>

Yusuf Hikmet portrays the Ottoman state as a foreign body politic occupying the Turkish homeland of Anatolia.<sup>67</sup> He views the Ottoman polity as an ethnically multi-layered entity, which was all but anathema to the principle of Turkish nationalism propagated by the Kemalist Republic. Yusuf Hikmet's lecture presents the Turkish social group as the prime-mover in Ottoman attempts to combat the internal deficiencies of state and society. In an *İkdam* article (5 December 1333/1917), Ahmed Refik talked only about Damad İbrahim Paşa and his Turkish, as well as Muslim, character.<sup>68</sup> There he claimed that following the Treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718), the Ottomans had not come to the realisation of the dangers besetting their Empire.<sup>69</sup> In contrast, he argued that his shrewd and gifted protagonist Damad İbrahim had realised the situation, which he set out to remedy by means of the promulgation of beneficial policies. Yusuf Hikmet and Ahmed Refik both seem to have considered Turkishness as the prerequisite of patriotic zeal, even where the Ottoman Empire's territorial integrity was concerned.

### **The Effects of the History Thesis**

The primary outcome of the *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi* was the recognition

of the Hittites as the earliest Turkish presence in Anatolia, predating the foundation of the Ottoman State (1299), the battle of Malazgirt (1071) and even the emergence of Islam (622). The government had thus taken a stance that was to guide the Turkish population away from its Ottoman past. Mustafa Kemal's intention in setting up a scientific organisation to research Turkey's history was to discredit the importance of Islam and of the Ottomans, and to investigate the possibility of an earlier Turkish presence in Anatolia.<sup>70</sup>

The series 'Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları' continued propagating these newly formulated theories.<sup>71</sup> But nevertheless, the reality of the Muslim and Ottoman part in Turkish history was too large to be ignored completely. The first series of drafts ('müsvedde'), I. Seri, was published in the same year (1932). Ahmed Refik wrote a small contribution on the Ottoman dynasty (20 pp.).<sup>72</sup> Şemsettin [Günaltay] considered the area of Central Asia at the time of Islamification (89 pp.).<sup>73</sup> Yusuf Akçura even wrote a small treatise on the sources available concerning the origins of the Ottoman state (14 pp.).<sup>74</sup> In the end, however, the contributions dealing with Hittites, Etruscans, Sumerians or Scythians were in the majority, and constituted the main thrust of the government's drive towards Turkey's 'new' history.<sup>75</sup> The second series of the 'Ana Hatları', published in 1934, also contains two contributions by Ahmed Refik dealing with the Ottoman dynasty and the *devşirme* (procurement of slave soldiers) system.<sup>76</sup> The fact that this government-sponsored publication called upon Ahmed Refik's services indicates the degree to which his previously established reputation as an Ottoman specialist was still able to assert itself in spite of the fact that, on a personal level, he had clearly fallen from favour.

Invigorated by such government-sponsored establishments and declarations, history academics and schoolteachers started to spread the new doctrine of the *Tarih Tezi* in the wider country. According to Âfet İnan, after the conclusion of the history congress the government distributed the afore-mentioned four-volume history textbook in schools nationwide, effectively replacing Ahmed Refik's *Umûmî Tarih*. Yusuf Akçura[oğlu]'s lecture also dealt with this four-volume history, which he had even called an 'umumi tarih', implicitly acknowledging its aim of replacing Ahmed Refik's book.<sup>77</sup> These volumes were the first public announcement of the 'official history' doctrine printed in the new Turkish alphabet.<sup>78</sup> The *TTTC*<sup>79</sup> prepared the books, simply entitled *Tarih I-IV*, and subsequently delegated their distribution to the Ministry of Education.

### The Kemalist Classroom in the 1930s: *Tarih I-IV*

In his aptly-titled *Kemalist Rejimde Öğretim ve Eğitim* (1938) Kâzım Duru, a former Young Turk who became a Kemalist educationist, states unequivocally

that history education was not meant to be a chronological presentation of events. Rather, history as taught in school should consist of courses suggestive of the former heights attained by the Turkish nation. Duru even argues that a strong patriotic sentiment was a commonly accepted virtue among the different nation states of the world at the time. The issue of history instruction was put high on the educational agenda of the early Republic of Turkey. The Kemalist leadership regarded history education as the primary means of educating (or indoctrinating) future generations of Republican citizens.<sup>80</sup>

The history textbook, *Tarih I – IV*, set out to teach the *TTTC*'s findings to the younger generations of the newly established Republic. The first volume deals with prehistory and ancient history. It stresses the ancient character of the Turkish presence in Anatolia, trying to persuade pupils that the Hittites had been the earliest Turks to settle there. The textbook observes a programmatic approach to the teaching of historical knowledge in the classroom. The first volume of the school books simply states the following, combining the findings of the *TTTC* with a strong sense of Turkish nationalism:

The research undertaken in Anatolia, [which indicates] that the Turks by coming and settling have made their sacred homeland for at least seven thousand years, is continually bringing the date of the Anatolian Hittite civilisation, which now can be traced to 4,000 years ago, back a few centuries more.<sup>81</sup>

The first volume of the 1931 textbook is a distillation of the results of the various pieces of research that would be presented at the *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi* held the following year. It looks as if Ahmed Refik's earlier published school textbook effectively became an anti-nationalist tract in the eyes of Kemalist supporters. Ahmed Refik, the erstwhile chairman of the *TTE*, became an academic figure whose continued devotion to Ottoman history and history writing effectively turned him into a scapegoat for the political need of the Kemalist establishment to turn its back on the old historiography.

The third volume contains an extremely condensed account of the entire 600 years of Ottoman history.<sup>82</sup> The committee of writers divide the volume into four parts, the first two dealing with the foundation and establishment and the latter with the decline, disintegration and destruction of the Ottoman Empire. This volume thus presents Ottoman history as a period of 619 years, divided into an initial era of establishment and rise (279 years) and a latter era of decline and decay (340 years). The latter period is again broken up into several stages: an 'Era of Stagnation (1579-1683)', an 'Era of Retreat (1683-1792)' and finally the 'Fall and Dissolution of the Empire (1792-1919)'.<sup>83</sup> The textbook presents the Empire's final 340 years as the period of the Ottomans' slow

descent into defeat at the hands of the West. The first two stages coincide with Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin's earlier-mentioned periodisation.<sup>84</sup> Whereas these two earlier authors divided the final Ottoman century into the periods of *Tanzimat* and *Meşrûtiyet*, the new school text simply describes these years as the final 'Decline and Fall' of the Ottoman enterprise.

The *TTTC* committee of writers regards the death of the Grand Vezir Sokullu Mehmed Paşa in 1579 as the beginning of the waning of Ottoman fortunes, just as Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin had done in their textbook.<sup>85</sup> They go on to call the seventeenth century as a whole a period of stagnation.<sup>86</sup> The volume presents Vienna's second siege at the end of the century as heralding the Ottoman retreat from the European scene, a position similar to Ahmed Refik's view of Ottoman history.<sup>87</sup> The early eighteenth century then saw the reign of Ahmed III (1703-30), and another chapter in the Ottomans' unsuccessful wars with the West, culminating in the Treaty of Passarowitz (1718).<sup>88</sup> Upon concluding this agreement, Ahmed III's son-in-law and Grand Vezir İbrahim Paşa dispatched diplomatic missions to the Austrian Emperor and the French King. The textbook posits that these missions informed the Grand Vezir of the new traits of western civilisation.<sup>89</sup> In describing the Damad's policy decisions, the committee apparently follows Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek]'s bold claim regarding İbrahim Paşa's instructions to Yirmisekiz Çelebi.<sup>90</sup>

### **The Traditional Kemalist Interpretation of Damad İbrahim (1931)**

As a 'man of intelligence', devoted to the pursuit of pleasure, the Grand Vezir prevailed upon the Sultan to indulge in hedonistic pastimes. The textbook declares that Damad İbrahim's endeavours were not completely of a European-inspired nature, stating that the upper-classes spent time in pleasure palaces and pavilions bearing Persian names, such as Saadabad, Nevbünyad and Bağüferah.<sup>91</sup> The members of the *TTTC* who had composed the school book thus follow the insights of Celâl Esad as well as Selim Nüzhet, calling the early eighteenth-century Ottoman aesthetic 'Persianate' ('acem-peresti'), a phrase that is reminiscent of Yahya Kemal's poem *Bir Sâki*, which describes the Ottoman lands as having been under the sway of Persianate tastes.<sup>92</sup> The textbook mentions that 'history books' proclaim this era a 'Tulip Age', when feasts and entertainments of a particularly Western inspiration had been organised.<sup>93</sup> The *TTTC* thus acknowledges the work of Ahmed Refik. Rather than simply accepting his interpretative stance, however, the committee of writers follows Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin's critical posture.<sup>94</sup> They consequently openly express their doubts about the European inspiration of the feasts, claiming that the entertainments organised by the Sultan and his Grand Vezir possessed a clear 'Oriental flair'.<sup>95</sup> After having passed such a verdict, the committee

propounds a view of the era that is at odds with Ahmed Refik's interpretation of the 'Tulip Age':

Apart from the fact that the tulip is a typical Oriental flower, the essential ingredients of the entertainments consisted of listening to [Oriental] music and tossing little gold coins from a distance into some women's veils, while pretty cup-bearers distributed raki and wine at the drinking parties that were organised on Oriental rugs spread out among beds of tulips.<sup>96</sup>

The anecdotal story regarding the throwing of gold coins into women's veils goes back to the *Netâyic ül-vukûât*, in turn relying on Şemdanizâde Süleyman Efendi's late eighteenth-century *Mür'î't-Tevarih*.<sup>97</sup> In addition, so as to give even more weight to the interpretation offered, the textbook's authors remark that traditional entertainers had been employed to perform Oriental dances. These performances did not recall strolling couples dotting the gardens of Versailles, the committee observes. They remark that elegant minuet ('*mönüe*') dances, such as were associated with the Versailles entertainments of Louis XIV (1661-1715), were also absent from the amusements organised in early eighteenth-century İstanbul.<sup>98</sup> Rather than viewing the era as consisting of an opening move towards the West, the Kemalist writers of the *TTTC* declare the essential incompatibility of the Ottoman entertainments practised under Ahmed III and the pastimes seen in then-contemporary Versailles. Sultan Ahmed III had supervised a completely Oriental form of diversions. In this instance they replicate Ahmed Cevdet's verdict, without however passing an explicitly condemnatory moral judgement on the actions of Damad İbrahim and Ahmed III. The volume relates the sudden end of Sultan Ahmed's reign as a rebellion of İstanbul's poor against the spendthrift hedonists of the 'Tulip Age'.<sup>99</sup> The *TTTC*, using the four-volume school textbook as its mouth-piece, expresses the verdict that the 'Tulip Age' had been an Oriental flowering.

The authors refer to the fact that statements suggestive of a rapprochement to the West can be found in some historical narratives, hinting at the monograph *Lâle Devri*.<sup>100</sup> The committee seems unable to resist Ahmed Refik's view of a lively interaction between France and the Ottomans under Ahmed III. They claim that Damad İbrahim had become utterly fascinated with Western entertainments, ornamentation and pomp.<sup>101</sup> But rather than appropriating Ahmed Refik's stance wholeheartedly, the school text gives an altogether more reserved account of the 'Tulip Age'. The Kemalist establishment of the early 1930s was not favourably inclined towards proclaiming the 'Tulip Age' a positive and beneficial era with regard to modernisation and progress, refraining totally from mentioning such phrases as *teceddüd* or *rönesans*. Arguably, the moral judgement of earlier writers might have induced them to view Ahmed III



as an Oriental sultan rather than an enlightened ruler. But instead of elaborating on the moral issues raised, the committee focuses on the wasteful expenditure of the Ottoman governing élite. The *TTTC* thus seems to adhere to Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin's criticism of Ahmed Refik's interpretation.<sup>102</sup>

The textbook, prepared by the *TTTC* and distributed by the Ministry of Education, set out to spread the message of the History Thesis in the nation's classrooms, conveying the message that the Ottomans should be distrusted. The volumes follow a clear teleological agenda, praising the Turkish race and people while presenting the Republic as the culmination of the development of Turkish history. The verdict on the Ottomans is not completely negative, albeit not very positive either. The writers clearly regard the Hittites as worthy of more praise. These books were a first government-sponsored undertaking to convince the Republic's population of the Turkish nature of the Hittites and the rather un-Turkish character of the Ottomans.

### The Popular Perception of Damad İbrahim

In spite of the government's reluctance to deal with the Ottomans in a positive fashion, on a popular level publications relating to Ottoman topics were still well received. The Turkish readership particularly enjoyed historical novels that dealt with Ottoman topics. In an article published in the popular magazine *Yedigün*, the novelist and columnist Sadri Ertem, for instance, remarks that in the field of fiction the historical novel proved to be the most popular genre at the time.<sup>103</sup> Ertem argues that the reasons for this popularity were of a twofold nature. On the one hand, he sees it a sign of the people's nationalist sentiments to be somewhat nostalgic about the nation's past. But at the same time, Ertem does not dismiss the tendency of escapism among the readership either.<sup>104</sup>

The architect and writer of historical fiction, Abdullah Ziya [Kozanoğlu], for instance, enjoyed wide public acclaim at the time, and went through his most prolific phase in the 1930s.<sup>105</sup> The author even wrote a novel on the Patrona Halil rebellion which explicitly mentions the phrase 'Tulip Age' in its title, *Lâle Devrinde Patronalılar Saltanatı*, first published in 1930. In this book Abdullah Ziya presents the latter part of Ahmed III's reign as having been given over to wasteful expenditure and debauched pursuits.<sup>106</sup> He describes the Sultan as a figure with a continual appetite for hedonistic pleasures.<sup>107</sup> He writes that these never-ending enjoyments took place in kiosks built by architects who had come from the West or the land of the Franks ('frenistan')<sup>108</sup> This statement appears crucial in Abdullah Ziya's understanding of the 'Tulip Age' as an era which initiated a movement of copying Frankish fashions. Abdullah Ziya had apparently read the relevant passages in the book *Lâle Devri*.<sup>109</sup> He uses the epithet 'şeyatinü insücin' to describe the nature of these Frankish architects.

This strange Ottoman phrase calling the architects ‘men and devils of a devilish nature’, seems somewhat ill-fitting in Abdullah Ziya’s otherwise straightforward Turkish text. Additionally he places the sequence within inverted commas, indicating its status as a quotation supposed to have been generally understood by the readers of the novel.

Selim Nüzhet’s seminal *Türk Matbaacılığı*, published in 1928,<sup>110</sup> offers a possible explanation. In the section dealing with Yirmisekiz Çelebi’s visit to a French printing establishment, not recorded in the *Sefâretnâme*,<sup>111</sup> he quotes the *vakanüvis* Çelebizâde Âsım. Selim Nüzhet reproduces a sentence written by Çelebizâde talking about the ambassador’s impressions of a printshop using the descriptive phrase ‘şeyâtin-i cins-i ins olan tâife-i efrencin imâl-i âlet-i fikr ü hayâl’ to talk about the ‘mechanical device employed by Franks’ to multiply books.<sup>112</sup> Çelebizâde qualifies the Franks as ‘men of the ilk of devils’ (‘şeyâtin-i cins-i ins’). In his novel Abdullah Ziya apparently relies on the *vakanüvis*’ words, as related by Selim Nüzhet, yet appears to have misread the phrase. He uses it to reinforce Ahmed Refik’s claim that Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim spent their time in buildings constructed according to French plans.

The ‘Frankish’ nature of these architectural garden backdrops amplified the population’s unease with the Sultan and his retinue’s un-Islamic pursuit of the pleasures of the flesh, he insinuates. As a result, a popular rebellion which used adherence to Islam as a battle-cry uniting the unsatisfied masses brought the government down.<sup>113</sup> Abdullah Ziya [Kozanoğlu]’s novel seems to betray that parts of Ahmed Refik’s interpretation of Ahmed III’s reign did survive into the 1930s, albeit on the level of popular reading material. Rather than seeing the ‘Tulip Age’ as indicative of modernisation, such as was to be aimed at by the *Tanzimat*, the phrase seems to have conjured up images of Ottoman wastefulness coupled with some aping of European styles and manners. The popularity of Abdullah Ziya’s novels meant that certain sections of Turkey’s public at large were informed about Ahmed III, Damad İbrahim Paşa and Patrona Halil.

### The ‘Tulip Age’ in *Sinekli Bakkal* (1936)

Awareness of a ‘Tulip Age’ in Ottoman history seems to have been much more widespread in the thirties. The phrase *Lâle Devri* even appears in the work of the critically acclaimed novelist and activist Halide Edib Adivar. Halide Edib started writing in 1908 with the publication of her articles in the daily *Tanin*.<sup>114</sup> She spent the period 1924–1939 abroad in protest against Mustafa Kemal’s autocratic rule and as a result of her husband Abdülhak Adnan [Adivar] supposed involvement in an attempt on the President’s life in İzmir. They spent a lot of time in London where Halide Edib wrote a novel entitled *The Clown and his Daughter* (1935). In 1936 this novel was serialised in the Turkish daily *Haber*

under the title *Sinekli Bakkal*.<sup>115</sup> The novel is set in a popular neighbourhood of İstanbul during the late Hamidian era. The main protagonist is a girl named Rabia and the book relates the events of her life. In the course of her young life Rabia becomes a renowned *hafız* (person knowing the *Kuran* by heart), endowed with a beautiful and touching voice. Her fame reaches the higher spheres of Ottoman society, which results in her visiting the *yalı* (shoreside palace) of Saffet Bey, Sultan Abdülhamid's second court chamberlain, to perform a reading of the *Kuran*. Upon entering the waterside residence she describes its elegance and taste in the following way:

Its furniture was refined . . . the product of a delicate taste. The numbers of rugs, [and] chandeliers was not excessive, but like all the other pieces, each one was a masterpiece. While passing though the hall her eyes were constantly caught by and transfixed by one or two monochrome depictions of the Tulip Age.<sup>116</sup>

In the above paragraph Halide Edib apparently tries to contrast Rabia's simple Turkish outlook with the sumptuous yet tasteful surroundings of the Ottoman world, symbolised in the dwelling of a high-ranking palace official.<sup>117</sup> Rabia, as a Turkish witness to the Ottoman lifestyle, is drawn to representations of the 'Tulip Age'. Even though this reference to the 'Tulip Age' is very brief, the unidentified monochrome representations mentioned would appear to signal that the phrase introduced by Ahmed Refik had by the mid-1930s entered Turkey's popular imagination. Even though Halide Edib does not provide any further information, the pictures can in all likelihood be identified with monochrome reproductions of paintings produced by Jean-Baptiste Vanmour in the 1720s. In his *Lâle Devri* Ahmed Refik also hints at Vanmour's popularity, a theme which he reiterated in an article in *Yeni Mecmûa*.<sup>118</sup> Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek], in his *Türk Matbaacılığı*, also hints at Vanmour's popularity in 'Turkey' (the East) as well as abroad (the West).<sup>119</sup> Vanmour's depictions of popular entertainments are congruous with Ahmed Cevdet's critical stance on the lax atmosphere present in İstanbul during Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*.

It would seem that the understanding of the phrase 'Tulip Age', as a shorthand for the interpretation of Damad İbrahim as a mere hedonist introduced into Ottoman as well as Turkish literature by Ahmed Cevdet, had entered the mainstream Turkish public opinion of the 1930s. This view of the 'Tulip Age' had apparently become current in the late 1910s<sup>120</sup> and continued into the 1920s.<sup>121</sup> In spite of Selim Nüzhet's attempts to alter the view of İbrahim Paşa as a mere pleasure-seeker, the understanding of the 'Tulip Age' on a popular level was apparently predicated on Ahmed Cevdet's condemnatory statements, which had been carried into the twentieth century by Ahmed Râsim.<sup>122</sup> Halide

Edib's treatment of the morals and behaviour of the Ottoman upper-classes under Sultan Abdülhamid seems to rest on her espousal of Cevdet Paşa's denunciation of Damad İbrahim as possessing key responsibility in the Empire's descent prior to Selim III's appearance. Halide Edib employs the character of Hilmi, the son of the *Dahiliyye Nâzırı* (Minister for the Interior) Selim Paşa, to voice a descriptive assessment of Ottoman high society as pleasure-driven, apparently common during the first decades of the twentieth century.<sup>123</sup> Halide Edib's appraisal of the Ottoman ruling classes, as voiced via the protagonist Hilmi in her novel *Sinekli Bakkal*, would appear to disclose that she regarded the Empire's ruling élite as having been preoccupied solely with ephemeral pleasures, and a precedent for such a sybaritic attitude had apparently been set by Damad İbrahim Paşa, the infamous Grand Vezir of the 'Tulip Age'. The book *Sinekli Bakkal* presents a slice of ordinary Turkish life against the background of the reign of Abdülhamid II, the despotic ruler who led the Empire into one of its darkest periods when high society was busy aping European fashions, habits and etiquette.<sup>124</sup>

### Ahmed Refik's *Lâle Devri* in the Republic of Turkey

Ahmed Refik's *Lâle Devri* itself, however, would soon become inaccessible to the new generation of Turkish readers as it was printed in the old Ottoman alphabet. This entailed that the view of İbrahim Paşa as a 'progressive' figure would eventually fade. As a result, the publisher İbrahim Hilmi [Çığırcahan] decided to reprint Ahmed Refik's book in the new script in 1932, a fact which indicates the popularity of the narrative of Damad İbrahim Paşa's rise and fall.<sup>125</sup> In 1929 İbrahim Hilmi published a textbook on the War of Independence, written by Ahmed Refik.<sup>126</sup> In the period 1932-1933 he not only re-published *Lâle Devri* but also released Ahmed Refik's studies on Turkish architects and on the *İlmiye* class.<sup>127</sup> Additionally, İbrahim Hilmi even issued a collection of Ahmed Refik's poems as well as his translation of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's letters.<sup>128</sup> İbrahim Hilmi thus made important contributions towards keeping the Ottomans on the Turkish publishing agenda, in spite of the government's dislike of the topic. He released *Lâle devri (sic)* in the series 'Genç Türk Kitaphanesi', intimating the way in which his company aimed to teach the younger generations the glories of the Turkish past.<sup>129</sup>

This new edition reorganised the text, adding chapter headings and divisions which make it easier for the reader to appreciate the message conveyed in the book. The table of contents presents the book's narrative in a chronological sequence: from 'Lâle Devrinden Evvel', detailing the situation of the Empire after the second siege of Vienna (1683), through 'Neşşehirli İbrahim Paşa', giving background information on the figure of Damad İbrahim and his spectac-

ular rise to the *sadâret*, a position he used to disseminate beneficial policies, and ‘Sa’dâbat ve Lâle Safalari’, which mentions the feasts and entertainments organised in the period as well as the extraordinary position of Saadabad in the urban network of early eighteenth-century İstanbul, to ‘Zevkin Sonu’, which relates the grisly end of the Damad’s life, terminating the positive impact of his beneficial policy decisions.

In addition, a number of small textual changes were made, fine-tuning the book’s message. A first important alteration was made in the part of the text dealing with Ahmed III’s architectural patronage. Ahmed Refik gives a detailed account of the *çeşme* (fountain) set up in front of the palace’s Imperial Gate (*Bâb-ı Hümayûn*). Ahmed Refik’s reliance on the insights of Charles Seignobos is demonstrated in an earlier chapter.<sup>130</sup> In particular, his descriptive evaluation of the building as being executed in the ‘Arab style’ (‘arab tarzı’) recalls Seignobos’ appreciation of Islamic art and architecture. In the 1932 edition of the text, however, this verdict is completely reversed: ‘[t]he fountain’s layout and decoration were executed in the Western (“garp”) style.’<sup>131</sup> In 1913/15, Ahmed Refik’s text characterises the *çeşme* as a masterpiece of Oriental art. In 1932, however, the book *Lâle devri* describes the building in terms of a stylistic novelty.

In the Ottoman alphabet the word *arab* is written with the letters ‘ayin’, ‘re’ and ‘be’. The word *garb*, spelled as *garp* in the book, is conveyed with the letters ‘gayin’, ‘re’ and ‘be’. In other words, even though the terms denote completely different concepts, they are only distinguished by a dot. It could be argued that the transcriber of the text had misread the word ‘arab’ as ‘garb’, more in line with the tenor of a book that attempted to transform Damad İbrahim into a pro-Western Ottoman ruler. Even though this is but a minor alteration in the make up of the text, its implications and ramifications are many.<sup>132</sup> The addition of a dot results in the building most intimately associated with Ahmed III becoming an architectural statement of the Ottomans’ willingness to adopt and adapt European forms and fashions in the early eighteenth century.

Another small addition was made in a paragraph dealing with Damad İbrahim’s policies. This paragraph, starting with the statement that ‘İbrahim Pasa had not been successful in establishing ideas of civilization in the country in conjunction with all of his efforts’, was changed and given a preamble that set the tone: ‘[o]nly ideas of the Tanzimat, inclinations towards copying institutions of the West had become somewhat apparent’.<sup>133</sup> In other words, the added sentence introduces the claim Ahmed Refik developed in his dispute with Fatma Aliyye.<sup>134</sup> In 1917 the historian asserted that Damad İbrahim had been one of the ‘harbingers of the *Tanzimat*’.<sup>135</sup> The addition to the 1932 edition of *Lâle devri* discloses that Ahmed Refik still adhered to an interpretation of the *Tanzimat* that was favourable to the Ottomans. He clearly understood

the proclamation of the *Tanzimat* as a concerted government effort to copy the advanced civilisation of the West, in an attempt to modernise the antiquated features of Ottoman society and administration.

Another addition was a small section giving historical background information on the area of Kâğıthane, disclosing that it had been in use as a pleasure ground since Byzantine times, and had enjoyed particular popularity under Sultan Murad IV (1623-39).<sup>136</sup> The section dealing with the architectural activity in İstanbul during Ahmed III's reign, containing references to both Isfahan and Versailles, was retained however. Another much larger change is the omission of a long programmatic section towards the end of the book. This passage supplies the reasoning behind the need for *medrese* reform. These pages describe Ottoman society as thoroughly Oriental and backward. In the section, Ahmed Refik even argues that the influence of the corrupt *ulema*, on individual sultans as well as on the population at large, was of a detrimental nature. The omitted pages emphasise the importance of Islam in providing both a means of social cohesion as well as the legal basis for the Ottoman Sultanate. The section contains a passage describing Ottoman Sultans as wielding both temporal and spiritual power, a comparative evaluation with Europe's clerical classes, and also a characterisation of the members of the *ulema* as supporters of the Arabic language, anathema to the principle of Turkish nationalism. One could argue that these omissions indicate that Ahmed Refik himself was responsible for the new edition of the text. The omitted passage is critical of individual Ottoman sultans, yet acknowledges the need for the continued existence of the sultanate.<sup>137</sup> The statements that were omitted had been part of the ongoing debate about the decline and revival of the Ottoman fortunes high on the publishing agenda of the Second Constitutional Era (1908-18). Even an implicit acknowledgement of the need to safeguard the institution of the sultanate was totally unacceptable in the 1930s.

In the section detailing the Patrona Halil rebellion, a further reference is added, which probably also points in the direction of authorial intervention. The new reference is to a work called *İstanbul İhtilalleri*, which could be identified as Louis de Chénier's *Révolutions de l'Empire Ottoman*, printed in 1789.<sup>138</sup> In his book, Chénier describes the rebellion toppling Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim in terms of an impoverished population rising against its pleasure-headed and spendthrift leadership.<sup>139</sup>

### The 'Tulip Age' and Nedim

Ahmed Refik's renown rested upon his book *Lâle Devri*, which already in the late-Unionist era had been transformed into a quasi-legendary text.<sup>140</sup> İbrahim Hilmi's new edition ensured that its popularity continued into Republican

times as well. The fact that İstanbul's municipal theatrical institution (*İstanbul Şehir Tiyatrosu*) decided to stage the Ottoman playwright Musahipzâde Celal's comic opera of the same title in 1936 seems to confirm the success of İbrahim Hilmi's effort.<sup>141</sup> In spite of the government's reluctance to acknowledge the 'Tulip Age' as a period worthy of attention, great parts of the public continued to be fascinated by the era of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim throughout the 1930s.

Literary critics, for instance, interpreted the latter part of Sultan Ahmed III's reign, and particularly Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*, as beneficial to the literary arts in their writings. As stressed earlier, during the constitutional era, Yahya Kemal had already shown the way towards appreciating Nedim as a genius of *Divan* poetry.<sup>142</sup> Critics, scholars and writers continued this trend in the Republican era. The writer Halit Fahri [Ozansoy], for example, even wrote a play entitled *Nedim* in 1932. The piece consists of three acts, the first one taking place in the garden of a *köşk* or mansion in the neighbourhood of *Saadabad*, the second in Nedim's house and the final part, after the rebellion, with Nedim hiding in a house in Üsküdar.<sup>143</sup> The play concentrates on Nedim's relationship with İstanbul's beauties and his reputation as a philanderer. The piece's narrative movement betrays a moral judgement: from the pleasures of *Saadabad* to the threat of death posed by Patrona Halil's rebels. In his monograph *Nedim*, İbrahim Alâettin [Gövsâ] describes İbrahim Paşa's term of office as a period of quiet and stability which had seen numerous entertainments.<sup>144</sup> He further explains the reasoning behind the denomination 'Tulip Age' with a reference to the fashion for flowers and particularly tulips prevalent in the 1720s, and mentions Nedim's reputation as the era's carefree and gay poet.<sup>145</sup> İbrahim Alâettin describes Nedim as an active participant in the diversions organised by the Sultan and his son-in-law.<sup>146</sup>

Hasan Âli Yücel wrote a piece on the Tulip Age as a 'false dawn' ('Fecri Kâzip'), that also explicitly deals with Nedim. Yücel gives the poet the rather fanciful sobriquet of the era's nightingale or 'devrin bülbülü'.<sup>147</sup> As a result, he implicitly hints at the refined artistic and literary taste of the time, while stressing Nedim's outstanding position in the field of *Divan* literature and poetry. The imagery of the nightingale and its beautiful singing voice are a standard *topos* in Islamic writing, insinuating a high degree of refinement and taste, while also implying a devoted pursuit of beauty.<sup>148</sup> In spite of this Islamic characterisation of Nedim, Yücel condemns the short-lived era on moral grounds, employing rather the Ottoman-sounding terms 'mest ve medhuş, hattâ biyhuş' ('drunken and bewildered').<sup>149</sup>

A year later, in 1938, Murat Uraz explains in his monograph on Nedim that Ahmed III had been a ruler with a strong predilection for sybaritic pursuits, describing the Treaty of Passarowitz as having removed all obstacles to pleasure

and enjoyment.<sup>150</sup> He argues that Nedim expressed this carefree mentality in his poems.<sup>151</sup> But, Uraz continues, Nedim had also brought a fresh spirit and life to the formalised *Divan* poetry.<sup>152</sup> Ahmet Cevat [Emre] further reasons that Nedim was a poet whose works deserved to be read today, in the Republican era.<sup>153</sup> He ascribes typically human traits (flirtatious, enamoured, depressed) to the poet and his works, supposedly absent in regular *Divan* poetry.<sup>154</sup> Even though the human characteristics listed by Ahmet Cevat do not appear to be very different from those used for *Divan* poets in general, his final verdict that Nedim had been a typical human being set separated from his predecessors, who supposedly adhered more closely to an ossified interpretation of poetry in the Islamic world. Throughout the 1930s, critics seem unanimous in praising Nedim while condemning his patrons as sybarites. This discloses that Ahmed Cevdet's view of Nevşehirli İbrahim had still been commonly accepted in the 1930s.

### **The *Türk Tarih Kurumu* and the Second History Congress (1937)**

The official state-sponsored research into the Turkish ancestry was far removed from such considerations of the literary or even artistic merit of the Ottoman past. Instead, in accordance with the language reforms, Mustafa Kemal, who became known as Atatürk following the introduction of surnames in 1934, renamed the *Türk Tarih Tetkik Cemiyeti* the *Türk Tarih Kurumu* (*TTK* or Turkish History Society) in 1935, thereby linguistically removing the establishment even further from its Ottoman forebear, the *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni*.<sup>155</sup> The historians themselves continued their scientific work, concentrating primarily on Turkey's ancient past and thus giving archaeological excavations special importance. In August 1937 the *TTK* organised the second Turkish History Congress (20-25 August 1937).<sup>156</sup> In the subsequently published proceedings, *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*, one can read that Şemsettin Günaltay voices the opinion that, whereas the first Congress had spread the *Tarih Tezi* nationwide, the second *Türk Tarih Kongresi* confirmed its validity against the critical attitude of world specialists. In all, he proclaims the decisive victory of the Thesis.<sup>157</sup> In her contribution Âfet İnan says that the most important task of the *TTK* was to conduct excavations.<sup>158</sup>

The contributions to the Congress persisted in an anti-Ottoman attitude, set out to elaborate further on earlier findings and continue to praise the establishment of the Republic.<sup>159</sup> Ahmed Refik was not present at the event. During the First Congress he had been publicly humiliated, and the research agenda observed by the contributors was far removed from his musings on the Ottoman past and research conducted in the archives. The historian who launched and popularised the 'Tulip Age' of the Ottoman Empire had effec-



tively been ostracised by this time. The Ottomans did not constitute a topic considered worthy of Republican attention.<sup>160</sup>

After all, Atatürk spent nearly twenty years of his life (1919-1938) establishing a nation state that was to erase any traces of the Sultan-Caliph and his followers. He had carefully tried to erase the Republic's links with the late-Ottoman Unionists in the mid-1920s,<sup>161</sup> and as a result, the name Ottoman emerged as a suspect concept in Republican circles. During the 1930s, the Ottoman Empire was a not too distant memory. Turkish schoolbooks of the latter part of the thirties continued to discredit the Ottomans and Islam. Instead, remarkable praise was bestowed upon various peoples of ancient history, as predecessors of the contemporary Turkish nation. In the 1930s, the Republican government adhered to a publishing agenda supportive of its reforms, which also led to the distribution of periodicals with more balanced contents beyond purely jingoistic proclamations encountered in school textbooks. These publications were not just destined for the internal market. The government also had external audiences in mind.

### *La Turquie Kemaliste* and Ernest Mamboury

For the benefit of the non-Turkish-speaking public the Turkish government commenced distributing *La Turquie Kemaliste* in June 1934, with contributions in French, German and occasionally in English. The editors express their aim as follows: '[I]a Turquie Kamâliste [*sic*] a pour but de vous faire connaître la Turquie nouvelle, la Turquie telle qu'elle est en réalité'.<sup>162</sup> In the second half of the decade this propaganda vehicle was to publish an important contribution to the discourse on the 'Tulip Age', in some ways straying from the official line on the topic. The editorial staff consisted of a diverse collective of writers. The Turkified academic Ernest Mamboury who had settled in İstanbul in 1909 and became a school teacher at the Galatasaray Lisesi in 1921, for example, was also a regular contributor to the periodical.<sup>163</sup> In 1935, he wrote a piece, entitled '[I]a Turquie Kamâliste [*sic*] Touristique', which lists various places of interest for a Western visitor.<sup>164</sup> In 1937, on the other hand, he wrote an article which deals with a rather specialised subject ostensibly beyond the scope of the periodical's editorial agenda: 'L'art turc du XVIIIème siècle'.<sup>165</sup>

In this piece Mamboury treats the Ottoman artistic landscape under Ahmed III and his successors. The many eighteenth-century relics in various parts of İstanbul provide attractive points of entry for dealing with this ruler and his time. Such pleasing monuments as the *çeşme* in front of the *Bab-ı Hümayûn* constitute focal points for touristic visits to the city.<sup>166</sup> Mamboury does not simply deal with the physical monuments of the early eighteenth-century Sultan:

In general Ahmed III is not counted amongst the reformist sultans, and yet, he was the first sultan to have looked, with an interested eye and unperturbed by any kind of prejudice, beyond the borders of the Empire to that despised and mistrusted Occident . . . One thus finds oneself, at the outset of the eighteenth century in the presence of new artistic manifestations, attesting to a new spirit, like an as yet incomplete return to beautiful nature. Ahmed III thus added the beauty of flowers and fruits, as indications of his penchant for nature, and elements of the Occidental style, as proof of his innovative spirit.<sup>167</sup>

At the outset of the article Mamboury deals with the general prejudice against eighteenth-century art and culture, on account of the era's association with the value-laden terms 'baroque' and 'rococo'.<sup>168</sup> In his view, however, such a judgement is clearly unjustified, as 'Turkish art experienced a 'double et belle Renaissance' in the first half of the century.<sup>169</sup> Mamboury dismisses the seventeenth-century Ottomans as enthusiastic hunters.<sup>170</sup> He follows this negative assessment with '[m]ais un grand monarque, Ahmed III, monta sur le trône en 1703 et y resta jusqu'en 1730'.<sup>171</sup> He characterises the Sultan as 'artiste et poète lui-même, amoureux de la nature, des fleurs, des beaux-arts, des fêtes et des cérémonies'.<sup>172</sup> Mamboury stresses the ruler's penchant for nature by drawing attention to the *Yemiş Odası* (Fruit Room) in the Topkapı Palace's *Harem* section, laid out in 1705: its walls display a 'décoration picturale à l'huile, de fleurs et de fruits'.<sup>173</sup>

After having asserted Sultan Ahmed's personal sophistication and his love of the natural world, Mamboury relates Yirmisekiz Çelebi's trip to Paris. He describes the ambassador as an 'homme d'esprit, ouvert et cultivé'.<sup>174</sup> His mission had been to study western civilisation, Mamboury assures his readership.<sup>175</sup> On this point he seems to have relied on Selim Nüzhet's *Türk Matbaacılığı* and Celâl Esad's *Türk Sanatı* (1928).<sup>176</sup> On his return to İstanbul, the ambassador brought back plans of the Château de Marly and decorative details of Versailles, the author informs his readers. Thus he claims that Yirmisekiz Çelebi had introduced the 'style Louis XV' into the Ottoman Empire.<sup>177</sup> This contrasts with Ahmed Refik's claim that it was the Frenchman Lenoir who had been responsible for transmitting the plans of French palaces.<sup>178</sup> Mamboury credits the Ottoman ambassador himself with the introduction of these architectural novelties. These declarations lead Mamboury to announce a 'Turkish artistic Renaissance':

Plans and objects brought back [from Europe] thus served from then on as models for local artists who created a true Renaissance of Turkish art. This period in art is called the Tulip Age. One can thus suppose that at

the outset of the eighteenth century İstanbul sheltered a series of Turkish and foreign artists whom one can find at the basis of the Renaissance of Turkish art.<sup>179</sup>

The idea of connecting the term 'Renaissance' with Turkey under Ahmed III was first floated by Ahmed Refik in the Turkist periodical *Yeni Mecmûa*.<sup>180</sup> In the early Republic, Selim Nüzhet had partly taken over this claim in his *Türk Matbaacılığı*, using the term 'ıntibâh' ('awakening') rather than 'Renaissance'.<sup>181</sup> Celâl Esad was also influenced by Ahmed Refik when he claimed that Ahmed III's reign witnessed a 'new power and revival' in the field of the arts and aesthetics, using the term 'teceddüd' ('renewal').

Ernest Mamboury appropriates these assertions, particularly Celâl Esad's references to a 'teceddüd', which is an Ottoman term normally used to refer to the Renaissance. In combination with Ahmed III's earlier claimed love of nature, Mamboury continues that this sudden flowering of artistic talent in İstanbul led to the production of 'painted' and 'sculpted' depictions of fruit and flowers.<sup>182</sup> This new decorative language was kept in use under Mahmud I as well, Mamboury observes. But he then mentions that, as a result of the instability of aesthetic conditions in the eighteenth century, by the 1740s local patrons had changed their decorative policy. These new shapes eventually led to the construction of such *rococo*-inspired buildings as the Nuruosmaniye (1754-1757) and the Lâleli (1763) mosques.<sup>183</sup>

Apparently basing his insights on the depictions of fruits and flowers on the monuments associated with Ahmed III, Mamboury pronounces a value judgement on the Ottoman Sultan's personality and his actions as a patron of the arts. Mamboury combines his personal knowledge of French visual culture and Ahmed Refik's verdict on the Sultan to propose the exceptional status of the early eighteenth century in general and Ahmed III's reign in particular. Ernest Mamboury transforms the 'Tulip Age' ('l'époque des tulipes') into a 'Turkish Renaissance' in the field of the arts, a sudden outburst of artistic and cultural activity that revived 'Turkey'. The author apparently employs the term 'Renaissance' in a purely technical [art-historical] sense, similar to Celâl Esad's use of 'teceddüd'. Mamboury implies that Sultan Ahmed's lively patronage of the arts, as demonstrated in the highly visible monuments of his reign, had given rise to a thriving activity amongst the local artists and artisans. This revived art production leads the author to speak of a 'Renaissance'. This term seems doubly apt in view of the preponderance of flower and fruit motifs, intimating a growing interest in nature, analogous to Renaissance painters' new aesthetic of naturalism.<sup>184</sup>

### Renaissance: Teceddüd, İntibâh, and Uyanış

In view of the momentous developments in Republican Turkey the usage of the term 'Renaissance' was clearly value-laden, as already pointed out. Turkish intellectuals conceptualised the Kemalist revolution as a 'Renaissance', and regarded the phrase to be synonymous with modernism and secularism ('lâdini'), unwittingly relying on Burckhardt and Nietzsche's interpretive templates.<sup>185</sup> The narrower technical meaning of the word was also well-known to Turkish intellectuals. They were aware, however, that from this purely art-historical context the term's meaning had been expanded to encompass a wider sociological field, as amply illustrated in Hasan Cemil's afore-mentioned piece 'Hars Tebdilî'.<sup>186</sup>

Hasan Âli Yücel's article about the literary genius of Nedim in the context of the 'Lâle devri' also utilises a vocabulary of 'awakening'.<sup>187</sup> Even though the piece is concerned with literary history, Yücel employs this opportunity to pass judgement on Damad İbrahim's term as Grand Vezir.<sup>188</sup> He refers to the establishment of the printing press and Yirmisekiz Çelebi's trip, before dealing with the patronage of architectural constructions that had been so prominent in the 1720s.<sup>189</sup> Rather than explicitly mention the term 'Renaissance', Yücel identifies in Damad İbrahim's era a progressive mood similar to that which had characterised the reign of Mehmed II (Fatih) (1451-81), which itself had coincided with the 'movement of awakening' in Europe (the Renaissance). In this instance, Yücel employs the Turkish version, 'uyanış', of the Ottoman term *intibâh*. But in view of the short duration of the eighteenth-century 'awakening', he rather wistfully calls the twelve-year period a 'false dawn' ('fecri kâzip')<sup>190</sup> This brief article contains an important value judgement on the latter part of Ahmed III's reign, far superseding the context of Ottoman literature, *Divan* poetry and the figure of Nedim.

The editorial staff of *La Turquie Kemaliste* probably imagined that by means of publishing Mamboury's article they had supplied the potential tourist with arguments connecting Turkey with Europe even before the establishment of the Republic. The hidden agenda behind its publication could have been a desire to dispel any whiffs of Oriental exoticism that could create undesired expectations in potential tourists. In a way, Mamboury's piece insinuates that in the early eighteenth century the Ottomans had begun casting off their traditional opposition to the Christian world, and had started to liberate themselves from the dogmatism of Islam, through a new inclination towards the natural world. By elaborating upon Ahmed Refik's designation of İbrahim Paşa's term of office as a 'Renaissance', which had arguably been induced by Ziya Gökalp's well-known enmity to the Ottomanist *Tanzimat*,<sup>191</sup> Mamboury had cast Sultan Ahmed III in a different light from other Ottoman sultans. Whereas, in the official view of this period, the Ottomans in general deserved nothing but criticism, Mamboury's piece shows the early eighteenth-century Sultan as an individual worthy of praise.



## Chapter II/3

# The ‘Tulip Age’ as a Prelude to the *Tanzimat*: The Re-Appreciation of the Ottomans and Islam, 1940-47

During the 1920s and 30s, the Kemalist leaders of the young Republic were not able to cope with Turkey’s immediate Ottoman past. In other words, the *TTK* as well as the whole of the intellectual establishment of Turkey were at the time not able to establish a satisfactory form of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* — to borrow a German phrase — that could have allowed the Ottomans to re-enter the historiographical narrative unhampered. Whereas Ottoman topics had nevertheless occasionally crept up in the 1920s and 30s, the 1940s, by contrast, saw a proliferation of studies explicitly dealing with the Republic’s imperial ancestry. Particularly with regard to the ‘Tulip Age’ this decade proved to be very fruitful. The inhibitions against Ottoman history were arguably due to Atatürk’s personal distaste for the Ottoman state. It would appear that in Atatürk’s life-time historians easily condemned the Ottoman era as reactionary and *dinci* (observing a religiously motivated agenda).<sup>1</sup> In this way they contributed to the development of an intellectual trend that was to equate the terms ‘Ottoman’ and ‘Islamic’ in Turkey’s Republican consciousness. They openly pronounced a verdict on the incompatibility of the Ottomans and modern Turkey, indicating that even a small mention of the Ottomans was regarded as suspect. Atatürk’s death on 10 November 1938 must have played a large part in attempts to reconcile the Republican regime with its imperial predecessor. The Kemalist system under Atatürk’s successor İsmet İnönü, then known as the *Millî Şef* or ‘National Leader’, displayed a somewhat different approach to the past. For example, Mustafa Kemal’s Unionist rival Kâzım Karabekir saw ‘his [political] career . . . at an end for as long as the radical wing around Mustafa Kemal . . . dominated the scene’. Following Atatürk’s death, however, he entered political life anew, even becoming chairman of the TBMM (1946-8), and proceeded to publish his own version of the Turkish War of Liberation, *İstiklal Harbimiz*.<sup>2</sup> Throughout the first two decades of the Republic’s existence, however, the ideological system of Turkish nationalism and secularism, known as Kemalism,

had attempted to replace Islam as a means of defining the cultural and intellectual identity of the population of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace.

### Establishing a Kemalist University

The intellectual establishment of the early Republic still rested on foundations established by the previous regime. Sultan Abdülhamid II's foundation of a university under the name of *Darülfünûn-ı Şahâne* on 15 August 1900/18 Rebiyülâhîr 1318 still provided the Republic with its academic establishment during its first decade.<sup>3</sup> The Republic attempted to mould this institution into an acceptable shape with a draft law (1 April 1924) envisioning the expansion of the university, renamed the *İstanbul Darülfünûnu*. The government subsequently published a *Talimatnâme* (21 April 1924) solidifying the suggested measures.<sup>4</sup> These measures did not satisfy the regime and early in 1932 the Ministry of Education commissioned the Swiss educationist Professor Albert Malche to investigate the academic quality of the *Darülfünûn*.<sup>5</sup> He presented his report to the government on 29 May 1932.<sup>6</sup> Prior to the report's publication the writer Ahmet Cevat [Emre] interviewed Malche for the periodical *Muhit*.<sup>7</sup> In the course of the conversation, the Swiss academic stressed that the reforms necessary were primarily of a methodological nature.<sup>8</sup>

Soon after the report's presentation to the Ministry, the *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi* (2-11 June) took place. The findings presented at the Congress led some observers, such as the journalist Ali Süreyya, to the conclusion that the academic institution inherited from the Ottomans proved incompatible with the current understanding of scientific research and knowledge propounded by the *TTK*.<sup>9</sup> A year later, a meeting held in the Ministry of Education on 15 May 1933 resulted in the presentation of a draft law. A fortnight later, parliament (*TBMM*) accepted Law no. 2252 (31 May 1933). Its first article proclaims that on 31 July 1933 the *Darülfünûn* and its attendant institutions would be abolished.<sup>10</sup> The second article states that on 1 August a 'new institution', carrying the name *İstanbul Üniversitesi*, was to be established.<sup>11</sup>

Before this drastic reform the staff at the Faculty of Letters (*Edebiyat Fakültesi*), comprising the fields of history, geography, literature, and philosophy consisted of 14 professors (*müderriis*), 4 lecturers (*muallim*), and 6 assistants.<sup>12</sup> After the inauguration of İstanbul's 'new' university, the same faculty numbered 6 professors (*profesör*), 6 junior professors (*aday profesör*), 4 lecturers (*muallim*), and 5 foreign members of the teaching staff.<sup>13</sup> A large number of the *Darülfünûn*'s personnel was simply dismissed, while a certain number was pensioned off or re-commissioned to other government posts or school teaching positions.<sup>14</sup> Approximately thirty members of the Faculties of Law and Letters lost their appointments. The Faculty of Theology (*İlâhiyat Fakültesi*) was abol-

ished altogether. In all 157 people were purged from the *Darülfünûn*. The historians Yusuf Behçet [Güçer], Ali Muzaffer [Göker], Avram Galanti [Bodrumlu], İsmail Hakkı [Baltacıoğlu] and significantly, Ahmed Refik [Altınay] were dismissed.<sup>15</sup> The *TTE*, as the successor of the *TOE*, was summarily abolished as well.<sup>16</sup> Individuals and institutions with a particularly Ottoman flavour were simply removed from the Republic's academic machinery.

### The Case of Ahmed Refik

The case of Ahmed Refik, the former chairman of the *TTE* and propagator of the 'Tulip Age', is symptomatic of the general anti-Ottoman mood present in the early Republic. Following the dissolution of the Ottoman army in 1918, Ahmed Refik became a lecturer at the *Darülfünûn*.

In the academic year 1924-25, his course on Ottoman history at the *Darülfünûn* was renamed 'Türkiye tarihi', which actually meant that he was to deal with the latter period of the Ottoman Empire leading up to the establishment of the Republic, a teleological scope similar to that of the school textbook prepared by Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin.<sup>17</sup> During the summer recess Ahmed Refik was arrested as a suspected member of the *Tarikat-ı Salâhiye* and tried in Ankara (8 July-16 August 1925). Following his acquittal, he continued teaching at the İstanbul *Darülfünûn*. After the establishment of the new İstanbul University (*İstanbul Üniversitesi*), however, he was dismissed. His course was partially continued by the eminent İbrahim Hakkı Uzunçarşılı until the academic year 1938-39.<sup>18</sup> In other words, from the academic year 1933-34 onwards Ahmed Refik was effectively unemployed. It is interesting to note therefore that he wrote a rather poignant article published in the weekly *Yedigün*'s 29 October 1933 edition. The article ostensibly commemorates the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the foundation of the Republic.<sup>19</sup> In fact, the piece reads as a eulogy of Mustafa Kemal and his *İnkılâb* reforms. Ahmed Refik depicts Mustafa Kemal as a 'divine hero'.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, the Ottoman historian proclaims that Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk] had personally ensured the emergence of a new 'historical consciousness' amongst the Turkish people.<sup>21</sup> Ahmed Refik used his association with *Yedigün* to publicly announce that he had also become susceptible to the History Thesis and, by implication, to Turkey's new understanding of the Ottomans. But this panegyric proved to be ineffective with regard to his employment prospects at the University of İstanbul. The Republican leadership had effectively ostracised the hapless historian.

The Ottoman historian Ahmed Refik was ideologically on shaky ground in the Republic of Turkey. He had been a fervent supporter of the Ottomans in the preceding period. In the course of the First World War, for example, he had even composed an overt propaganda booklet, bestowing virtues that were du-



bious in Republican eyes upon members of the dynasty. Ahmed Refik's propaganda text tries to combine Muslim zeal and patriotism: '[i]n our leaders [the Ottoman sultans] patriotism took the form of [an act of] faith ("imân)".<sup>22</sup> And in an interview conducted on 15 September 1336/1920 for *Dersaadet Gazetesi*, Ahmed Refik even states that 'the religion of Islam ("İslâmiyet")' 'is the [one] thing that constitutes the strongest link between the Turks'.<sup>23</sup> A historian able to entertain such ideas in public must have seemed highly suspect in Republican eyes. In his famous history textbook *Büyük Tarih-i Umûmî* he proclaims the Ottomans to have entered Anatolia as a tribal unit, a phrase in line with Namık Kemal's well-known assertion in his poem *Hürriyet Kasidesi* regarding the spectacular rise of the Ottomans from humble beginnings.<sup>24</sup> Ahmed Refik even describes their Central Asian origins as 'primitive' ('ibtidâî').<sup>25</sup> These assessments are in strict contradiction with the Republic's view of Turkish history in Anatolia and Central Asia.<sup>26</sup> On a purely historiographical level, Ahmed Refik's methodological integrity was also cast into question by the fervent Turkish nationalist Yusuf Akçura during the First *Türk Tarih Kongresi* (1932).<sup>27</sup> And finally, his attack on claims relating to a Turanian or Central Asian origin of the Hittites in his *Umûmî Tarih* must have turned the Ottoman historian into a personal enemy of the Republic's new interpretation of Turkish history.<sup>28</sup> In his textbook, Ahmed Refik even asserts the unattractive appearance of the Hittites, describing them as 'yellow-skinned', 'droopy-lipped and black-haired people'.<sup>29</sup> The Republican authorities must have understood these derogatory comments as a personal attack on Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the ultimate patron and defender of the Hittites' Turkish character. The anecdotal account of Atatürk's personal interaction with the historian on Büyük Ada, where the President of the Republic publicly humiliated the Ottoman historian, would seem to point in the direction of personal as well as ideological reasons behind Ahmed Refik's downfall.<sup>30</sup>

Ahmed Refik continued to write as a free-lance author, publishing in various newspapers and periodicals. He retired permanently to the island of Büyük Ada near İstanbul, where he tried to make ends meet and eventually died in relative poverty (10 October 1937).<sup>31</sup> The periodical *Yedigün* devoted its 20 October 1937 issue to the historian, publishing numerous pieces commemorating the former chairman of the *TTE*.<sup>32</sup> İbrahim Alaeddin Gövsa, for instance, recalls Ahmed Refik's 35-year career as a writer and academic, describing him as the first Turkish historian to have undertaken serious research on [Ottoman] 'archival records'.<sup>33</sup> Gövsa also comments on the lack of appreciation and the neglect that had been the fate of the historian during the last years of his life.<sup>34</sup> But rather than ascribing this to any political or ideological reason, Gövsa points towards the author's intemperate personal life as having constituted the cause of his downfall. İbrahim Gövsa decares that Ahmed Refik was commonly

'known as a bohemian and a [somewhat] scatterbrained historian, as only befits the [writer of the] Tulip Age . . . the fact that he was left unemployed as a result of the latest university reforms must undoubtedly stem from this'.<sup>35</sup> Gövsa's judgement shows that the *topos* of the sybarite Damad İbrahim, established by Ahmed Cevdet in the mid-nineteenth century based on the late eighteenth-century Şemdanizâde Süleyman Efendi, still held sway over the Turkish intelligentsia at the close of the 1930s.

The zealous Kemalist Falih Rıfki [Atay], for his part, was outspoken in his condemnation of Ahmed Refik.<sup>36</sup> In his commemorative piece Falih Rıfki claims that the former chairman of the *TTE* had never really been a true historian endowed with scholarly erudition.<sup>37</sup> The accusation mirrors Yusuf Akçura's words during the First Congress on Turkish History in 1932.<sup>38</sup> Falih Rıfki declares Ahmed Refik to have been a mere populist ('Vulgarisateur').<sup>39</sup> Rather cynically he remarks that Ahmed Refik's absence at the second *Tarih Kongresi* had not been due to the author's ill-health.<sup>40</sup> Whereas Gövsa showers the deceased historian with praise, Falih Rıfki [Atay] asserts that Ahmed Refik's stance as a historiographer had been incompatible with the Republican view on the writing of history.

The misfortunes suffered by Ahmed Refik in the process of the Ottoman university's transformation into a Republican institution are symptomatic of the unpalatable nature of the previous system in 1930s Turkey. From the Kemalist point of view, *İstanbul Üniversitesi* emerged as an ideologically sound centre of academic excellence, and so remained throughout the 1930s and beyond. In spite of the rather obvious ideological purpose of expunging unwanted and suspect elements from the university's roster, Kemalist intellectuals insisted upon the purely academic nature of the initiative. In 1943, Cemil Bilsel, in his history of the university, states that the abolition of the *Darülfünûn* had taken place only to found a more 'productive' academic institution.<sup>41</sup> In the end the University of İstanbul came to occupy the position of the primary Kemalist institution of research and learning in Turkey.

### Commemorating the *Tanzimat*

Since 28 December 1938, Hasan Âli Yücel had been Turkey's Minister for Education (*Maarif Vekili*), a position with responsibility for the wider dissemination of Kemalist thought in the country.<sup>42</sup> In a commemorative article, Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar remarks after Yücel's death that he had been the most successful Minister for Education in the Republic.<sup>43</sup> These sentiments were echoed on many occasions by a great many Kemalist supporters, indicating the importance of Yücel's accomplishments. Celal Şengör, for instance, points out that during Yücel's tenure education in Turkey had become an institution based upon the

principle of scientific methodology, rather than superstition and religious beliefs.<sup>44</sup> But on a personal level, the intellectual Yücel combined both the cultural refinement of Islam (he was for instance a member of the Mevlevi), and the Westernist zeal of the Republic.<sup>45</sup> Yücel himself, in a short piece published in 1937, indicates that he had become 'violently opposed' to 'bigotry and bigots' as 'enemies of innovation', such as Patrona Halil and Kabakçı Mustafa had been, after having read Ahmed Refik's serialised works in various newspapers during the Constitutional era.<sup>46</sup> One could thus argue that Yücel's zeal for the goals of Kemalism was in large part due to Ahmed Refik's pen that had drawn Ottoman society as subject to the ill-effects of ignorance and bigotry.

The politician Hasan Âli Yücel displayed a lively interest in history and matters of historiography. The historian Zeki Arıkan views Yücel as a politician and an intellectual who attempted to deepen the historical consciousness of the inhabitants of Turkey.<sup>47</sup> Arıkan elaborates further that Yücel was a strong proponent of historical objectivity.<sup>48</sup> Yücel saw no contradiction between an even-handed appraisal of Ottoman history and his belief in the tenets of Kemalism. One could reason that his readings of Ahmed Refik's work had made him susceptible to the idea that the course of Ottoman history was led astray by selfish and greedy individuals who had used Islam as a ploy to influence the 'ignorant masses'. Yücel's policies and achievements disclose how he regarded a revived appreciation of the Islamic Ottoman era as enriching the secular nature of the Republic of Turkey. In early 1939, Hasan Âli Yücel decided to commemorate the centennial of the *Tanzimat's* proclamation on 3 November 1839 (26 Şaban 1255) with the publication of a massive book with contributions by the Republic's premier historians and specialists.

The commemoration of the *Tanzimat* is illustrative of Yücel's approach to Turkish history. In his preamble to the newly established periodical *Tercüme*, published 19 May 1940, Yücel hints at the *Tanzimat's* import with regard to the Turkish appreciation of Europe as the centre of gravity of developments and revolutions in civilisation.<sup>49</sup> In view of the earlier extreme enmity of Ziya Gökalp and Turkish nationalists to the *Tanzimat* as a product of the multi-national Ottoman ideology,<sup>50</sup> Yücel's position and the government's apparent espousal of his conciliatory stance on the issue appear as indicative of a sharp shift in the understanding of Turkish nationalism during the *Millî Şef* era, when İsmet İnönü was President of the Republic (1938-50).

Yücel contacted the *TTK* and *İstanbul Üniversitesi* for support in May 1939. Hasan Cemil Çambel was at the time the President of the Turkish History Foundation (1935-1941), while the University of İstanbul was headed by the above-mentioned Cemil Bilsel. Both were staunch Kemalists. The contributions to the massive tome (1026 pages), entitled *Tanzimat. Yüzüncü yıldönümünü münasebetile* and published in 1940,<sup>51</sup> were composed by members of the academic staff of *İstanbul Üniversitesi*,

thus ensuring the pro-Kemalist nature of this partial reappraisal of the Ottomans.

At first sight, looking at a sample of the contributions to the volume, it would appear that the memorial was employed to discredit the Islamic component of the Ottoman Empire. For example, Sadri Maksudî Arsal had been asked to write a piece on the characteristics of theocratic and secular states, 'Teokratik Devlet ve Lâik Devlet'.<sup>52</sup> Arsal argues that the Ottoman state had only developed into a true exponent of theocracy during its period of decline. Even though Sultan Selim I (1512-20) had acquired the Holy Cities and secured the Caliphate for the Ottomans, Arsal thinks that his successors had not employed a caliphal policy in their international affairs.<sup>53</sup> In his view, the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (21 July 1774)<sup>54</sup> constituted the first official recognition of the Ottomans' claim to the Caliphate and thus marked the beginning of the ascendancy of religion in Ottoman politics. He states that the treaty's *de facto* recognition of the Ottoman Caliphate led 'Turkish sultans' to entertain universal pretensions as the head of the world of Islam.<sup>55</sup> In his view the era 1774-1876 saw the gradual strengthening of the theocratic character of the Ottoman state, only to reach its full expression under Abdülhamid II (1876-1909).<sup>56</sup> Sadri Maksudî Arsal's article characterises the *Tanzimat* as a partial failure in view of the later Ottomans' espousal of the caliphal cause. By contrast, the Ottoman historian Ahmed Refik's *Lâle Devri* maintains that Ottoman sultans in general adhered to their claim to be the Caliph of Islam, and that this has led to the preponderance of the *ulema* in Ottoman politics.<sup>57</sup>

The authors of the varied contributions to the volume had all written their pieces in a similar vein. Rather than simply praising the proclamation of the *Tanzimat* as a victory for Turkish progress, none of them fails to point out the generally negative influence of the Ottoman tradition as a manifestation of backward Islam. The authors thus make sure that their readers would not forget what a great stumbling block to liberalisation and progress the Ottoman centuries had been. Thus it would seem that certain sections of the Kemalist intelligentsia had clearly not abandoned Ziya Gökalp's condemnation of the *Tanzimat* in 1940.

### The 'Tulip Age' as a Precursor

Younger contributors, such as Enver Ziya Karal, were a lot more positive about the achievements of the *Tanzimat* and the Ottomans. Karal's contribution to the volume accepts the proclamation of the *Tanzimat* as a positive road-sign on the way to the Republic. In addition, his piece establishes an understanding of the phrase *Lâle Devri* arguably still current today. Karal occupied the post of lecturer in Modern History at the University of İstanbul between 1933 and

1940.<sup>58</sup> His publications prior to the *Tanzimat* centennial primarily dealt with late eighteenth and nineteenth-century issues. His contribution to the commemorative volume, on the other hand, takes account of the *Tanzimat*'s long-term precursors: 'Tanzimattan evvel Garplılařma Hareketleri'.<sup>59</sup>

Karal divides his piece into four parts, comprising the beginning of the movement of Westernisation, its general character, its several stages, and a conclusion.<sup>60</sup> In talking about the 'Lâle Devri' (a phrase he even uses as one of his subheadings<sup>61</sup>), in the early eighteenth century, Enver Ziya Karal makes explicit reference to Ahmed Refik. Karal declares that Ahmed Refik had spoken about a lively intellectual exchange between the Ottomans and the West at the time.<sup>62</sup> In addition to Ahmet Refik, he also mentions a Republican authority certain of the presence of Western influences in early eighteenth-century Ottoman society: 'Professor İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarřılı is also convinced of the fact that Western influences entered the Ottoman Empire in this period.'<sup>63</sup> Professor Uzunçarřılı had been a young man during the Ottoman Empire's last years. On a purely methodological level, he was a strong proponent of archive-based history-writing, as had been advocated by the *TOE*.<sup>64</sup> As mentioned earlier, following Ahmed Refik's dismissal from the University of İstanbul, Uzunçarřılı had taught a course in continuation of the former's classes.<sup>65</sup> Karal refers to an article Uzunçarřılı had written on the life of the reformist statesman Halil Hamid Pařa, active in the late eighteenth century (1935).<sup>66</sup> Before starting his in-depth study of the personality of Halil Hamid, Uzunçarřılı prefaces his article with an introductory section (section 'I').<sup>67</sup> The first paragraph sets out the negative effects of the Treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718). The second paragraph then begins by asserting Damad İbrahim's long and positive tenure as Grand Vezir (1718-1730), going on to mention the Treaty of Belgrade (1739), and finishing by alluding to the tenures of Hekimođlu Ali Pařa (1732-35, 1742-3, 1755) and Koca Ragıb Pařa (1756-63).<sup>68</sup> The introductory section ends with the assertion that Halil Hamid had witnessed firsthand the need to reform the Empire's internal structure according to a Western model, in addition to announcing the example set by his predecessors: '[I]ike those who understood the necessity of initiating reforms according to a European model -- [Damad] İbrahim and Koca Ragıb Pařa'.<sup>69</sup> In spite of this positive verdict, Uzunçarřılı does not appear to think highly of Damad İbrahim's policies, calling his actions 'half-hearted' attempts.<sup>70</sup> One could also argue that the author dismisses the achievements of Halil Hamid Pařa's predecessors in order to highlight the exceptional position of the actual protagonist of his article. Uzunçarřılı had not devoted any research to either Damad İbrahim or Koca Ragıb. He simply reiterates commonly acknowledged information on these personalities current in the 1930s, without including any references. Uzunçarřılı decks the remainder of his text with no less than 107 references.

These numerous footnotes include, for example, citations of Ahmed Cevdet's *Tarih*, a manuscript version of *Enverî Tarihi*, kept in the library of the University of İstanbul, the Turkish translation of an article written by Auguste Boppe, executed by Ahmet Refik, as well as numerous documents ('Hazinei evrak vesikalari, Mühimme defteri'). But Uzunçarşılı had not displayed a similar meticulousness in dealing with Damad İbrahim or Koca Ragıb, as these figures remain outside the main scope of the article.<sup>71</sup>

In his contribution to the *Tanzimat* volume Enver Ziya Karal nevertheless regards Uzunçarşılı's perfunctory mention of Damad İbrahim's twelve-year *sadâret* as carrying the same import as Ahmed Refik's book on the 'Tulip Age'. Basing himself on these two authorities, he comes to some controversial insights: '[i]t seems self-evident that there is the possibility of tracking the Tanzimat's faraway sources to the Tulip Age'.<sup>72</sup> As a conscientious historian, Karal nevertheless subjects the notion of a 'Tulip Age' to a certain scrutiny, saying that until then the term was used solely to talk of a hedonistic era.<sup>73</sup> In other words, he recognises the continued validity of Ahmed Cevdet's verdict. But, he states, a number of young Turkish thinkers had recently reached the conclusion that in the field of Turkish art this era had constituted a 'Renaissance' (using the transcribed version 'rönesans').<sup>74</sup> It seems that on this point Karal is basing himself on Mamboury's article in *La Turquie Kemaliste* as well as on Celâl Esad [Arseven]'s *Türk Sanatı* and Selim Nüzhet Gerçek's *Türk Matbaacılığı*.<sup>75</sup> He remarks nevertheless that these two views of era — one giving a glimpse of debauched pleasures, and the other showing an artistic Renaissance — should be regarded as 'exaggerated', sufficing to announce the following:

In truth, the Tulip Age was above all the expression of a new understanding of life . . . [and] [t]he tulip was nothing but the symbol of a new mentality.<sup>76</sup>

The tulip carries a symbolic function in Karal's text, as a flower supposedly expressive of a societal change. Karal proclaims the tulip to be an emblem of the appearance of European influence in Ottoman society. In the space of one decade Turkish historians had thus performed a remarkable U-turn.

In 1931, the *TTTC* had pronounced the tulip to be a true exponent of the Orient.<sup>77</sup> In 1940, on the other hand, the historian Enver Ziya Karal, at the time an associate member of the *TTK*, expressed a very different opinion. His writings do not describe the tulip as a flower indicative of the Orient but rather as an entity suggestive of the Occident. Karal refers to the ambassador Yirmisekiz Çelebi as the link between the Ottomans and the West, as his visit to Paris had supposedly led to numerous effects in the Ottoman capital. In this respect, he relies on Selim Nüzhet Gerçek's seminal *Türk Matbaacılığı*, re-published in 1939.<sup>78</sup>

In chapter II/1 it has been shown that Selim Nüzhet Gerçek fabricated a phrase which supposedly reflects Damad İbrahim's set of instructions to the Ottoman ambassador Yirmisekiz Çelebi. Rather than relying on an eighteenth-century document or text, Gerçek seems to have conflated words and phrases borrowed from the nineteenth-century Ali Suavi and the eighteenth-century Raşid Mehmed Efendi, to write that Damad İbrahim had ordered Yirmisekiz Çelebi to acquire information about France's civilisation and to describe its means of prosperity and education — possibly applicable in an Ottoman context. As in the earlier edition of his own text *Türk Matbaacılığı* (1928), Gerçek here does not supply any reference for this supposed quotation either.<sup>79</sup> Enver Ziya Karal simply reproduces Gerçek's bold statement:

In the instruction that Damad İbrahim Paşa gave to Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed who was sent to Paris on an embassy was the expression "to make a thorough study of the means of civilization and education".<sup>80</sup>

Following this appropriation of Gerçek's outrageous phrase, and obviously regarding the instructions ('talimat') to have been authentic, Karal goes on to claim that '[t]his embassy report, which is like a kind of photograph of all the places [Yirmisekiz Çelebi] visited and saw, will for the Ottomans be the first window opened to the West'.<sup>81</sup>

Karal in his *Tanzimat* article "Tanzimattan evvel Garplılama Hareketleri" quotes Gerçek's re-published *Türk Matbaacılığı* as a trustworthy source to show that early eighteenth-century Ottoman rulers wanted to alter the Empire's relationship with the West. But Selim Nüzhet's more recent publications in the new script do not contain such a verdict on Ahmed III's reign at all. In his *Türk Gazeteciliği* ("The Turkish Press"), published at the beginning of the 1930s, for instance, Selim Nüzhet declares that the roots of a 'renewal' or 'Renaissance movement' ('teceddüt harekâtı'), as initiated by Sultan Abdülmecid (1839), could only be traced to the reign of Mustafa III (1757-1774)<sup>82</sup> It seems that the subsequent re-edition of his *Türk Matbaacılığı* created the impression that Sultan Mustafa's father, Ahmed III, stood at the basis of a 'Renaissance movement' leading ultimately to the establishment of the Turkish Republic.

Enver Ziya Karal, in turn, calls the establishment of the printing press an outcome of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's mission.<sup>83</sup> Karal ends his account of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim with an assessment of the rebellion that toppled the government.<sup>84</sup> He views this rebellion as the first 'interruption' of the movement towards Westernisation. Karal ends his piece on the *Tanzimat*'s predecessors by making the following bold claim in his conclusion: 'Western influences had started to penetrate Ottoman society a century and a few years before [the proclamation of] the Tanzimat'.<sup>85</sup> In other words, Karal clearly points towards

the ‘Tulip Age’ as the beginning of the Westernisation of Ottoman society. His statement ‘Tanzimattan bir asır ve birkaç sene evvel’ (‘a century and a few years before’), subtly indicates that Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim had been the ultimate founders of an Ottoman policy of Westernisation. Karal even goes as far as calling the period between the reigns of Ahmed III and Abdülmecid a ‘century-long pre-*Tanzimat* era’ (‘bir asırlık Pré-Tanzimat devri’), which had been subject primarily to French influence.<sup>86</sup> After having made this confident announcement, however, he admits that these Western traits had only been of a rather limited nature, unable to affect the sultan’s authority or Ottoman state organisation until the appearance of Sultan Mahmud II (1808-39).<sup>87</sup> But still, the historian Enver Ziya Karal does recognise Western traits in the military, social and cultural fields.<sup>88</sup>

### The New Kemalist Reception of the *Tanzimat* and the ‘Tulip Age’

The following year (1941), Ömer Lütfi Barkan published a well-received critique of the volume.<sup>89</sup> Upon Ömer Lütfi’s graduation from the *Darülfünûn* in 1927, the government sent him to Strasbourg to study philosophy, sociology and economics. In France he studied under the renowned historian Marc Bloch, which likely made an indelible mark on his outlook as an historian.<sup>90</sup> After his return he immediately joined the ranks of the new University of İstanbul (1933).<sup>91</sup> He actually also contributed to the *Tanzimat* volume.<sup>92</sup> At the outset of his critique he pays lipservice to the History Thesis, opining that the present volume on the *Tanzimat* should be valued as ‘a draft of and introduction’ to further research to be undertaken.<sup>93</sup> He praises the Ministry of Education for being at the forefront of a new ‘age’ and ‘interpretation’ in the field of academic research.<sup>94</sup> In this connection Barkan is particularly appreciative of Enver Ziya Karal’s contribution:

In the same way the information given by Doç. Enver Ziya Karal about the movements of Westernisation prior to the *Tanzimat* and the origins and characteristics of these movements shows how the influences of Western civilisation, which occupy an important place among the true factors leading to the *Tanzimat*, should be understood.<sup>95</sup>

Barkan’s positive criticism of Karal’s piece indicates that, after approximately two decades of Kemalist rule (1923-40), the Republic started to look for predecessors in its immediate historical vicinity, rather than simply rely on the ‘historical myths’ created in the previous decade. Lütfi Barkan’s article stresses the importance of Karal’s piece in determining that a policy of Westernisation had been effective in an Ottoman context prior to the proclamation of the *Gülhâne*



*Hatt-ı Hümayûnu* in 1839. Like Karal, Ömer Lütfi Barkan acknowledges that Western influences had possessed a limited impact in the century preceding the *Tanzimat*:

In this way it can be understood that during the 100 years which preceded the *Tanzimat* in Turkey a deep and meaningful coalescing [of Eastern and Western elements] was present, even if these primarily took place on a military and cultural plane.<sup>96</sup>

The century preceding Sultan Abdülmecid's reform policies had seen an important interaction with the West. Ömer Lütfi Barkan's end-verdict on Karal's piece appears to be wholly positive and laudatory. Barkan thus gives his assent to the claim that the 'Tulip Age' had constituted the long-term predecessor of a policy of Westernisation in a Turkish-Ottoman context.

Enver Ziya Karal was thus able to establish himself as an authority on Sultan Ahmed III, and the Republican establishment was to call upon him again in that connection. As part of the grand translation effort started in 1940, the Ministry of Education, under Hasan Âli Yücel's direction, had also commenced translating the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (*EI*), which had been created under the aegis of the International Union of Academies, coordinated by Universiteit Leiden, and published by E. J. Brill in four volumes (1913-1938). The *EI* still stands out as the standard reference work in the field of Islamic studies.<sup>97</sup> The mere fact that a Turkish government department undertook to distribute an encyclopaedic work explicitly dealing with the world of Islam is testament to the intellectual shift taking place during the 1940s. The first Turkish volume, with augmented sections on special Ottoman/Turkish subjects (*İslâm Ansiklopedisi, İA*), was published two years later (1942).<sup>98</sup> The Ministry convened a committee of members of the İstanbul University Faculty of Letters to undertake the task, and Enver Ziya Karal was called upon to write the piece on Sultan Ahmed III.<sup>99</sup>

This decision undoubtedly reflected the standing of the author's contribution to the *Tanzimat* volume. In his entry on 'Ahmed III (1673-1736)' he goes even further than the evaluation given in his 'Tanzimattan evvel Garplılama Hareketleri':

[The Ottomans] started preferring earthly delights over the promised bliss of the next world. The Tulip Age (1718-1730) is the era when heaven was sought on earth.<sup>100</sup>

Enver Ziya Karal, acting as a mouthpiece for the Ministry of Education, declares that the Ottomans under Sultan Ahmed III started to abandon their allegiance

to the religion of Islam. The historian abandons any reference to the *Tanzimat* or Westernisation in the entry, preferring to allow the description of the new worldliness to speak for itself. By referring to the delights of this world and the hereafter, Enver Ziya Karal pronounces a judgement arguably possessing a resonance in the contemporary world.

### The 'Tulip Age' and Secularism

The proclamation of the Republic had liberated Turkish citizens from the restriction of Islam and the *Şeriat*. In his earlier-quoted article 'Rönesans ve Türkiye' the secularist Ali Canip Yöntem describes the *Tanzimat* reform movement in similar terms.<sup>101</sup> He compares the movement to the European 'Renaissance' in that it had broken the restrictions of a religious mentality and led to a 'secular' system of thought which he called 'lâdini' ('a-religious').<sup>102</sup> In a Turkish context, the delights of this world, free from religious contemplation, were introduced as a result of the promulgation of the reforms of the early Republic (*İnkulâb*). The decision to partake of the delights of the mortal world was arguably crystallised in the consumption of alcoholic beverages. A strict interpretation of Islam explicitly prohibits the drinking of intoxicants in this world.<sup>103</sup> The Republic of Turkey proclaimed the consumption of spirits and alcohol legal for its citizens early in 1926. And subsequently, the government established a monopoly (*Tekel*) regulating its sale on 22 March.<sup>104</sup> In a subtle way Enver Ziya Karal's entry links the 'Tulip Age' with the Republic, bypassing the *Tanzimat* in the process.

In the encyclopaedia entry Karal next mentions that the Ottoman ruling élite under Ahmed III embarked upon a wide-ranging project to embellish İstanbul with numerous palaces and kiosks. Obviously following Ahmed Refik, he considers these architectural projects to have been inspired by plans from both East and West.<sup>105</sup> Karal employs these references to Ottoman architectural patronage to bolster his own statements about the Ottomans' sudden decision to abandon hope of the promised bliss of heaven, and to concentrate on the delights of the mortal world. He thus insinuates that under Ahmed III the power of Islam had been waning and a worldly atmosphere had instead pervaded İstanbul.

In 1941 Enver Ziya Karal became a full member of the *TTK*, a promotion which reinforced the weight carried by his contributions to the commemorative volume *Tanzimat* and to the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Instead of next devoting himself to the study of Sultan Ahmed III, Karal concentrated on studying Selim III, the *Nizam-ı Cedid* and the *Tanzimat* in the remainder of the decade.<sup>106</sup> In this way he insinuated that his work on Ahmed III and the 'Tulip Age' constituted the final word on the matter. Karal's proclamation that 'the Tulip Age was above

all the expression of a new understanding of life . . . [and] [t]he tulip was nothing but the symbol of a new mentality' have since become stock phrases reproduced by most scholars after World War II dealing with the era of Ahmed III.<sup>107</sup>

### The New Kemalist Understanding of the 'Tulip Age'

The first manifestations of Enver Ziya Karal's widespread influence can be found in Faik Reşit Unat's publication of a hitherto unknown document supposedly indicative of a reformist atmosphere under Ahmed III. Unat published the text in the state-sponsored periodical *Tarih Vesikaları*.<sup>108</sup> The publication *Tarih Vesikaları* (*TV*) itself was also an indication of the Ottomans' renewed respectability during the *Millî Şef* era. It was set up in June 1942 by Hasan Âli Yücel's Ministry for Education. During the Constitutional era one of the goals of the *TOEM* had been to publish documents unearthed in the Ottoman archival holdings.<sup>109</sup> The Republican *TV* was an official endorsement of the fact that historians were again being encouraged to undertake research in the extensive archives of the Ottoman Empire. The fact that documents relating to Republican history were presented on an equal footing to Ottoman pieces appears to signal that at long last official Kemalist historiography no longer vilified the Ottoman past as a matter of principle. In the first issue Unat and İhsan Sungu present documents relevant to the War of Independence and the Republican alphabet reforms,<sup>110</sup> while Tahsin Öz and Cavit Baysun publish pieces relating to Selim III, Mahmud II and the *Tanzimat*.<sup>111</sup>

Faik Reşit Unat's publication of a document that he significantly describes as a 'Reform Memorandum' ('Islahat Takriri') relating to Ahmed III's reign was presented in the periodical's second issue (August 1941).<sup>112</sup> Unat discovered this piece, a compendium (*lâyihâ*), in the pages of the *Tarih* of Sahhaflar Şeyhizâde Mehmed Esad Efendi, which had never been printed in the original.<sup>113</sup> Recently Ziya Yılmaz's scholarly transliteration of this text has become available, allowing a wider dissemination of this important historical narrative.<sup>114</sup>

Even though the book relates the events of the period 1237-41/1821-25, Esad also inserted a document pertaining to the *sadâret* of Damad İbrahim into his text. Mehmed Esad supplies his rendition of this eighteenth-century source with a short introduction. He indicates that Ottoman armies had been experiencing growing difficulties in their battles with Christian forces since the year 1,000/1591-92. This situation led to a desire and willingness to imitate the efficient arms and methods used by the Christians.<sup>115</sup> The memorandum itself is written in the form of a dialogue between an Ottoman soldier asking questions ('Suâl-i Osmanî') and a Christian officer supplying replies ('Cevâb-ı Nasrânî'). The identity of the author of this fictitious conversation is unknown. According to Niyazi Berkes this text must have been composed by a Muslim.

He argues that '[t]he document does not appear to have been written by a foreign observer'.<sup>116</sup> Unat proffers the suggestion that the presence of the Hungarian refugee Rakóczy and the convert Mütefferika must have been instrumental in the composition of this memorandum during Damad İbrahim's tenure as Grand Vizir.<sup>117</sup> In view of the absence of any kind of archival or documentary evidence relating to this *lâyiha*, one has to accept Mehmed Esad's assertion that this document had been presented to İbrahim Paşa, even though the *vakaniüvis* does not supply any source to support this claim.<sup>118</sup>

Mehmed Esad takes the text at face value, simply assuming that it had been penned by a Christian officer. The eighteenth-century document presents fifteen questions relating to the success of Christian arms on contemporary battlefields and to possible ways in which the Ottomans could emulate such efficiency. The Christian officer explains the principles underlying the establishment of a standing army, stressing the virtues of conformity, regularity and strict discipline with regard to the actual body of the soldiery.<sup>119</sup> The Christian assertion is that with the establishment of such regularised armies, the Austrians had started to become more and more successful in war, leaving the soldiers of Islam unable to resist their onslaught.<sup>120</sup> The document describes the organisational reforms that had ensured the military success of the Austrians as an 'art'. The Christian officer drives home the point that an un-reformed Ottoman army was no match for the disciplined standing armies of the West.<sup>121</sup> The whole argument seems to rest upon the Ottoman term 'nizâm'. Even though the eighteenth-century Ottomans were clearly no strangers to concepts of order and discipline, the Christian rhetoric insinuates that Ottoman warfare had in the eighteenth century become antiquated in term of its disciplinary framework. The ninth exchange between the Ottoman and the Christian contains the clear advice that the Ottomans should adopt proper methods of military organisation:

But its deficiencies are these: however numerous, heroic and skilled soldiers may be, as long as they do not acquire [a proper] discipline ("nizâm"), they will not be able to achieve honour [on the field of battle], and the bravery and courage of the[ir] officers alone will not suffice.<sup>122</sup>

It would appear that the Christian officer employs the Ottoman term 'nizâm' to denote concepts of modern military organisation based on rational principles and disciplinary efficiency.

But in spite of the implied recognition of the organisational and military supremacy of the West, the document's message remains couched in an unshaken belief in the superiority of the Islamic way and the Ottoman tradition. A case in point, for example, appears in response to the Ottoman's question about what should be done in case of a ceasefire. The Christian offers the advice

that discipline and training ('*nizâm*') should be introduced in conjunction with a reinvigorated application of the rules and regulations laid down in the Islamic law.<sup>123</sup> Mehmed Esad indicates that this memorandum had been presented to Sultan Ahmed III through the offices of Damad İbrahim.<sup>124</sup>

The fact that Unat published the text in 1941, employing the rather tentative phrase 'İslahat Takriri' or 'Reform Memorandum' as its title, has ascribed rather far-reaching intentions to Damad İbrahim Paşa, the apparent patron of the project.<sup>125</sup> Twenty years later Bernard Lewis seems to agree cautiously with Unat's reading of the eighteenth-century piece, stating that the text 'would appear to embody a plea for military reform'.<sup>126</sup> And Niyazi Berkes, writing a couple of years later, even proclaims that '[t]his document contained in embryonic form the whole eighteenth-century debate on reform', placing reformist opinion against the conservative or traditionalist position.<sup>127</sup> In the 1980s the Austrian scholar Anton Schaendlinger translated the document into German, thereby ensuring its wider circulation amongst non-Turkish scholars.<sup>128</sup> In his assessment of the *lâyihâ*, however, he seems to have relied heavily on Lewis's insights.<sup>129</sup> The fact that this eighteenth-century document had only been accessible in manuscript form must have prevented other historians and writers, such as Ahmed Cevdet or Tayyazâde Ahmed, from consulting its contents. In view of the cautious language employed in the *lâyihâ*, in combination with its unshaken belief in the superiority of the Islamic path and the Ottoman tradition, it appears rather difficult to ascribe great value to its supposed attesting of the presence of a Westernist reform-minded spirit under Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*.

The fact that the contemporary *vakanüvis* Râşid Mehmed and Çelebizâde Asım do not mention this text in their books appears puzzling as well. Mehmed Esad, writing at the outset of the nineteenth century, seems to have unearthed and copied the *lâyihâ* in his efforts to present convincing arguments for Mahmud II's drastic reform policies. Rather than calling this document an argument in the eighteenth-century controversy surrounding reform, one could see its attempts to explain the recent success of Christian arms on the battlefield as aimed at soothing Ottoman concerns. Far from advocating the introduction of radical innovations, the *lâyihâ*'s message was that a determined return to Islamic rectitude and a reinvigorated disciplinary framework for the formerly well-organised Ottoman armies ('*Asker-i İslâm*') would suffice to defeat the Christian armies. The fact that Unat nevertheless feels at ease to describe this text in terms of a discourse on reform that had supposedly taken place under the auspices of Damad İbrahim discloses the depth of Karal's impact on the way in which Turkish intellectuals conceptualised early eighteenth-century Ottoman government policy during the 1940s. In the same issue Unat also published a map that had been printed by Müteferrika.<sup>130</sup>

In 1943, Akdes Nimet Kurat's studies on the Swedish King Charles XII (1697-1718) constitute a further step in the direction of the universal acceptance of the new Kemalist understanding of the phrase 'Tulip Age'.<sup>131</sup> Charles XII had spent some time in the Ottoman Empire (1709-1714), which made this king an ideal object of study for historians working on an Ottoman-European rapprochement. Quite naturally, Ahmed Refik had also published a serious study on this figure in 1916.<sup>132</sup>

Even though this topic actually precludes him from dealing directly with the 'Tulip Age', Kurat is nevertheless influenced by the notion.<sup>133</sup> He calls Ahmed III the 'ruler of the Tulip Age',<sup>134</sup> recognizing the hedonistic tendencies and intemperate character of Sultan Ahmed, also calling him extremely greedy.<sup>135</sup> In this, he had possibly relied on Ahmed Refik's work.<sup>136</sup> The Turkish historian uses the testimony of the French Ambassador, the Marquis de Ferriol, to describe Sultan Ahmed as a melancholy figure, reminiscent of Albert Vandal's description.<sup>137</sup> Furthermore he describes the Sultan as being inclined to a rather negative outlook,<sup>138</sup> while also being prone to merry-making. But the Sultan also possessed artistic and aesthetic talents, particularly in the fields of calligraphy and painting.<sup>139</sup> Kurat seems to have based himself on the available literature on Ahmed III in detailing these traits. He was the first known historian to explicitly mention the sultan's artistic side. Kurat also hints at the latter part of Ahmed III's reign, beyond the scope of his studies, as a period of 'positive and lasting activity', insinuating the progressive tendencies of the sultan, brought out by his son-in-law, İbrahim Paşa.<sup>140</sup> However, Kurat admits that the true nature of these movements had not been visible in the period under consideration.<sup>141</sup> In spite of this disclaimer, one cannot but remark that the mere fact that Akdes Nimet Kurat feels the urge to hint at these features of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim's reputations suggests that the *a priori* negative verdict first voiced by Şemdanizâde and then inserted into Ottoman history writing by Ahmed Cevdet was starting to be abandoned after the publication of the *Tanzimat* volume.<sup>142</sup>

### A Pleasurable yet Progressive 'Tulip Age'

In the nineteenth century the presence of European refugees, such as Charles XII, Stanislas Lecsinzky, FÉrenc Rakóczy and the Comte de Bonneval, in the Ottoman lands brought the Austrian Hammer-Purgstall to regard Ahmed III as a figure deserving special attention.<sup>143</sup> In the Constitutional era Ahmed Refik devoted a serious study to the Swedish King. In a way, the presence of Europeans on Ottoman soil seemed to strengthen the opinion that Ahmed III had been positively inclined towards the West. Ahmed Refik's indefatigable efforts to champion the cause of the 'Tulip Age', in combination with the recent

re-appreciation of the *Tanzimat* gave rise to the articulation of a new *topos* in Turkish history-writing. In the 1940s, this *topos* of the pleasurable yet progressive ‘Tulip Age’, overseen by Ahmed III, became popular even beyond the historical community.

The President of İstanbul Üniversitesi, M. Cemil Bilsel, even recounts a relevant anecdotal narrative in his history of the university (1943), betraying just how wide-spread Ahmed III’s new reputation of progressiveness had become. Bilsel relates how his predecessor Neşet Ömer İrdelp delivered a lecture dealing with an edict published by Ahmed III which regularised the practice of the medical trade in İstanbul. According to the document, numerous imposters had been active in the city at the time. Bilsel relates how İrdelp’s document further states that, as a remedy, Muslim, Christian and Jewish physicians active in İstanbul were to be registered and subjected to an examination.<sup>144</sup> As a well-respected academic and medical doctor, who had earlier even been Atatürk’s private physician, İrdelp delivered this talk on the occasion of the *Tip Bayramı* (Medical Festival). But in actual fact, the seminal text *Türk Matbaacılığı* (1928) also contains a mention of this document. Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, in turn, refers to a book written by Doktor Osman Şevki [Uludağ]. Selim Nüzhet’s relation, however, concentrates on Damad İbrahim Paşa as having secured the establishment of the principle of progress in the field of medical science, allotting a purely instrumental role to the Sultan.<sup>145</sup> The Medical Festival was used as a means of popularising medical science amongst the wider population, large sections of which were still influenced by irrational superstitions and sought solace in divine intervention rather than scientific medicine. By delivering this lecture, İrdelp indicated that Sultan Ahmed had been a progressive individual, concerned with the progress of science, and not at all reliant on blind faith and superstition. The fact that Bilsel includes this particular episode in his history of the University of İstanbul betrays just how Ahmed III had become a sultan, apparently in tune with the virtues of the Republic of Turkey in the popular imagination of the Turkish audience.

The celebration of the *Tanzimat*’s centennial gave Turkish intellectuals the opportunity to reassess Ottoman history. Even though the general verdict of the historians writing in the *Maarif Vekâleti*’s publication is not all that favourable, the general opinion on the *Tanzimat* was nevertheless modified. In the first decades of the Republic’s existence the definition of Turkish nationalism relied primarily on the ‘myths’ of the History Thesis for a diachronic dimension.<sup>146</sup> Atatürk’s death led to a recognition that the Ottoman era had also contributed to the formation of the current regime, in particular that the influence of the *Tanzimat* as a cultural movement of renewal and national awakening had been beneficial. In the 1930s such an appraisal would have been unthinkable.<sup>147</sup> This altered perception of certain aspects of the Ottoman past even led the fervent

Kemalist Cemil Bilsel after the publication of the commemorative volume to proclaim that the *Tanzimat* had not simply been a superficial desire to copy the West, but instead a progressive movement aimed at preventing the decline of the system.<sup>148</sup>

### Academic Interest in Ottoman Westernisation: New Turkish Literature at the University of İstanbul

Already in 1939, the University of İstanbul contributed to this reappraisal of the nineteenth century by opening up a new branch of study: a chair of 'New Turkish Literature' (*Yeni Türk Edebiyatı*) was inaugurated at the university's *Edebiyat Fakültesi*. The university authorities gave this prestigious position to the author, poet and academic Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, who held the position until his death in 1962.<sup>149</sup> This distinguished pupil of Yahya Kemal wrote a definitive monograph on nineteenth-century literary history in 1942, *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. The book deals with the period after the *Tanzimat*. Tanpınar prefaces his textbook with a general assessment of the 'Westernisation Movement'.<sup>150</sup> In his view, the Ottomans' relationship with the West, prior to the eighteenth century, and excepting political events, had been almost solely concerned with trade and commerce.<sup>151</sup> Tanpınar claims that while the West had been revolutionised in the sixteenth century during the 'Renaissance', a statement which betrays the influence of Nietzsche's thinking,<sup>152</sup> the Ottoman Empire remained unchanged.<sup>153</sup> Tanpınar thinks that the Ottomans had only become susceptible to 'new' ideas and movements in the eighteenth century. The author assures his students and readers that the reign of Ahmed III had witnessed such a remarkable change. He posits Yirmisekiz Çelebi's ambassadorial report as having constituted the link between the progressive West of the 'Renaissance' and the stagnant Ottomans of the early eighteenth century. Tanpınar literally states that '[n]o other book occupies such an important place in our history of Westernisation. In this work, almost every line of which is accompanied by a hidden idea of comparison, an entire programme is concealed'.<sup>154</sup> Tanpınar transforms the ambassadorial report into a text containing a hidden manifesto ('bütün bir program gizlidir'). Even though he readily admits the limited circulation of the book amongst contemporary Ottomans, he argues that its message was indicative of a changed state of mind.<sup>155</sup> Tanpınar thinks that this 'new mentality' was at the basis of a lively and unprecedented exchange between Europe and the Ottoman Empire.<sup>156</sup> Tanpınar asserts that French architecture, garden layouts and decorations influenced Ottoman patrons in their commissions. But the true importance of the 'Tulip Age', in his view, lay in a more tolerant attitude towards the outside world. Though this 'new' appreciation was only visible in a select group, Tanpınar nevertheless feels



at liberty to talk about a hitherto closed door being opened.<sup>157</sup> He admits that true reform movements had not been initiated during the ‘Tulip Age’, but instead says the era had but produced a ‘blueprint’ (‘tasavvur’ meaning ‘idea’ or ‘representation’ literally) for future military reforms.<sup>158</sup> As such, Tanpınar even argues for continuity between the reigns of Ahmed III (1703–30) and Mahmud I (1730–54), in spite of the ill-effects of the Patrona Halil rising.<sup>159</sup> Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar developed these ideas further in his celebrated collection of essays *Beş Şehir* (1946).<sup>160</sup>

### The Third Turkish History Congress (1943)

On an academic level, the Ottomans had clearly been exonerated in the early 1940s. This new forbearance towards Turkey’s imperial predecessor even moved the administration of Şükrü Saraçoğlu (in power between 9 June 1942 and 8 March 1943, and 15 March 1943–5 May 1946),<sup>161</sup> and the President İsmet İnönü to allow the re-burial of the remains of the erstwhile Unionist leader Talat Paşa on Turkish soil. On the night of 2–3 November 1918, Talat, Enver and Cemal Paşas had fled İstanbul ‘in a German destroyer with sundered lights’. In Berlin, Talat was killed by an Armenian named Soghomon Tehlirian on 16 March 1921, for his role in the massacres that attended the forced migration of Anatolian Armenians to Syria during the Great War. On 25 February 1943, Talat’s remains were transported to Turkey for re-burial.<sup>162</sup> Such a reconciliatory act that honoured the last Unionists Grand Vezir of the Ottoman state (February 1917 – October 1918), would have been unthinkable in Atatürk’s lifetime.

This act of political recognition for the Republic’s direct Ottoman predecessors was followed approximately eight months later by a willingness to deal with Ottoman topics at the third Turkish History Congress. The contributions to the congress were divided into three sections. Even though they were simply called *A.*, *B.* and *C.*, one can easily recognise that this partition corresponded to Prehistory (*A.*), Early Islamic History (*B.*), and Ottoman History (*C.*) properly.<sup>163</sup> In the published proceedings, the then chairman of the *TTK*, Şemsettin Günaltay continues to sing the praise of the History Thesis and the primacy of the Turkish race.<sup>164</sup> These sentiments are echoed by the *Maarif Vekili* Hasan Âli Yücel, saying that the Thesis had brought ‘the light of truth’ with it.<sup>165</sup> But some of the lectures read in the *C.* section were in stark contrast to these opening statements. A speech like M. Efdalrettin Tekiner’s contribution, dealing with the deficiencies in Turkish history, could not have been made had Atatürk still been alive. In his lecture Tekiner complains about the ‘rarity’ of people able to read the Ottoman alphabet (simply called ‘eski yazı’, as is still common today). Tekiner stresses the fact that it is a ‘necessity’ to be able to read the different

writing styles practised in the Ottoman period in order to study documents pertaining to ‘Turkish-Ottoman history’.<sup>166</sup> Such views are quite understandable as they were made by an academic who had been lecturing on Ottoman history since 1901/1317 and who had also been a founding member of the *TOE*.<sup>167</sup> The fact that the *TTK* gave him the opportunity to voice his concerns during the congress is symptomatic of a concerted effort on the part of the academic community to arrive at a more satisfactory form of *Vergangenheitbewältigung* during the early 1940s.

Ali Canip Yöntem even ventures to talk directly about the era of the ‘Tulip Age’ at the congress.<sup>168</sup> In his lecture about the poet Nedim he includes a brief characterisation of Damad İbrahim’s term of office:

After the Treaty of Passarowitz Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa wanted to create tranquility and affluence in the country. He set the people at ease. He displayed a favour towards scholars and poets, which had not been witnessed in any of the preceding vezirs. He awakened a spirit of optimism [in the people].<sup>169</sup>

Yöntem’s portrayal of the Grand Vezir is very much in line with Gerçek’s words, characterising the twelve-year period.<sup>170</sup> Quite remarkable, however, is his statement that the Ottoman statesman had displayed a close relationship with contemporary poets and scholars. This phrase amplifies the suggestion that the 1720s had been a time of cultural flowering and poetic licence. Ali Canip Yöntem mentions the habit of calling the latter part of Ahmed III’s reign a ‘Tulip Age’ and suggests that the era’s atmosphere of peace and prosperity had infiltrated Nedim’s *gazels* and *şarkis*.<sup>171</sup>

In specifically dealing with Nedim, Yöntem starts off by quoting the Ottoman writer Namık Kemal who called this eighteenth-century figure the ‘most powerful voice’ in Ottoman poetry, inclusive of an Ottoman *izafet* construction (‘sahib-i kudret’). Yöntem compares the eighteenth-century poet with the slightly earlier figure of Nabi, active and renowned throughout Mehmed IV’s reign.<sup>172</sup> He further relates how Nedim had died during the Patrona Halil revolt of 1730, thereby insinuating his intimate ties with the ‘spirit of optimism’ resulting from İbrahim Paşa’s new policy decisions.<sup>173</sup> He mentions that the phrase ‘Lâle devri’ is used for the period of Damad İbrahim Paşa’s rule, coinciding with Nedim’s life time.<sup>174</sup> In short, at least the reign of Ahmed III (1703–30), if not the whole of the Ottoman era receives words of praise at the third Turkish History Congress. The third History Congress and particularly this lecture suggest that the Kemalist intelligentsia had made peace with a certain portion of pre-*Tanzimat* Ottoman history.

### The *TTK's* Publication Policy

Following the conclusion of the third History Congress, the *TTK* published Faik Reşid Unat's edition of a hitherto unknown narrative source relating to the Patrona Halil rebellion, *Abdi Tarihi*.<sup>175</sup> In the work's preface, Unat proclaims the 1730 rebellion to have been of the utmost importance in the history of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>176</sup> The historian also indicates that he had been unable to discover one of the sources used by Ahmed Refik in his *Lâle Devri*, the *Defter* compiled by the *Şam Ruznamceci* Mehmed Hulusi Efendi.<sup>177</sup> During the Congress of 1943 the importance of the 'Tulip Age' had been recognised and publicly announced. Consequently, the *TTK* decided to publish additional source material that was meant to throw more light on the perfidious character of the rebels who ended the 'progressive' era of Damad İbrahim and the utterly negative impact of their actions on the development of Ottoman history.

But aside from such individual publications, during the 1940s the *TTK* undertook a number of hugely important projects, such as printing a grand world history in many volumes. Part of this undertaking was an impressive history of the Ottoman Empire (*Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*). The government of the Republic of Turkey thus pronounced its willingness to sponsor a revived interest in the Ottoman centuries. The editorial board gave the task of writing the volume dealing with the *Nizam-ı Cedid* and the *Tanzimat* to Enver Ziya Karal.<sup>178</sup>

The volume's scope does not strictly include Ahmed III and the early part of the eighteenth century. But this did not prevent Karal from inserting the 'Tulip Age' into his narrative dealing with the modernisation and Westernisation of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. Karal's text presents Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim as victims of the reactionary Janissary corps, just as Sultan Osman II and the Grand Vezir Halil Hamid.<sup>179</sup> Karal based himself primarily on his earlier published study of the *Tanzimat's* predecessors in the commemorative volume when making this significant assertion:

Whereas in fact, the influences of the West had started to enter the Ottoman Empire a century before the [proclamation of the] *Tanzimat*, in the reign of Ahmed III. For this reason it is more correct to regard the *Tanzimat* not as the beginning of efforts undertaken to renew the Ottoman state, but rather as one stage of these [various] efforts.<sup>180</sup>

Through including this implicit reference to the 'Tulip Age' in his work on such proven reform movements as the *Nizam-ı Cedid* and the *Tanzimat*, Enver Ziya Karal pronounces a clear and value-laden verdict on the early eighteenth century. Karal presents Sultan Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim Paşa as individuals whose limited enterprises formed the basis of the doctrine of the *Tanzimat*,

synonymous with the modernisation and Westernisation of the Ottoman system. Karal presents the proclamation of the *Gülhane Hatt-ı Hümayunu* as one specific stage in the development of the internal renewal of the Ottoman Empire.

### The Fourth Turkish History Congress (1948)

In 1948, the fourth edition of the Turkish History Congress left no doubt about the rediscovered respectability of Ottoman studies in the the *Millî Şef* era. The organisational make-up of the event was given a more compartmentalised expression. The lectures were divided into four sections, with the fourth section specifically reserved for 'Ottoman history'.<sup>181</sup> Upon the occasion of the fourth Turkish History Congress the Ottomans had been accepted wholeheartedly as subjects of scientific and academic scrutiny. The 'Hititoloji Doçenti' Sedat Alp was still able to lecture on the ancient land of Hatti, but employing a rather 'Ottomanist' methodology, one could argue.<sup>182</sup> In the published text of his lecture Alp considers the centralised administration of the Hittite Empire, in his view, able to hold diverse ethnic groups together and to withstand the continual onslaught of various enemy groups.<sup>183</sup> Sedat Alp still seems to have felt the need to provide the contemporary Republic with an exemplary predecessor. One could argue that he employs a somewhat anachronistic terminology suggestive of the Ottoman tradition in dealing with the Hittites. He uses a vocabulary reminiscent of the Ottoman *millet* system and employs phraseology redolent of the well-known longevity of the *Devlet-i Âliyye-i Osmanîyye* (1299-1918). Thus one could maintain that Sedat Alp had applied an Ottoman idiom to describe the politics of ancient Anatolia.

In the Ottoman section then, two lectures specifically dealt with the reign of Ahmed III. Efdalettin Tekiner speaks about the poet Nedim and the Grand Vezir Damad İbrahim, trying to unravel the location of their respective graves.<sup>184</sup> Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, on the other hand, develops the theme of the rebellion that put an end to Sultan Ahmed's reign and Damad İbrahim's life.<sup>185</sup> Baykal considers the sources available, particularly the account written by the *sırkâtip* (confidential clerk) Destarî Salih, which leads him to the conclusion that the revolt had been incited and organised by members of the class of religious scholars.<sup>186</sup> Baykal thus employs a hitherto untapped source to confirm Ahmed Refik's contention that members of the *ulema* orchestrated the government's downfall and Damad İbrahim's death.<sup>187</sup> Even though the intellectual atmosphere had by now become slightly more lenient towards dealing with the Ottoman period, the *a priori* verdict that the late-Ottoman era had been one of bigotry and religious intolerance was still very much alive. Baykal's lecture demonstrates to a contemporary audience that under Ottoman administration

religious fanatics had been free to threaten the internal stability of the state.<sup>188</sup> In the end, Baykal's unspoken message is that the Republican establishment could not afford to be indulgent towards religious agitation.

The progressive character of the 'Tulip Age' and even of Ahmed III personally had by now become proverbial in Republican circles. Karal's article and Tanpınar's literary history in all likelihood played no small part in the popularisation of the idea that the *Lâle Devri* had been a time unburdened by the religious bigotry normally associated with the Ottomans in the early Republic. The recognition of the fact that the 'Tulip Age' was a period out of harmony with the general Ottoman dynamic centred on the Islamic tradition functions within a general recognition of the importance of Ottoman history in the definition of Turkish identity following Atatürk's death in 1938.

### Ottoman Studies and Resurgent Islamic Feelings

Such officially approved interest in Ottoman history operated against the background of a revived public interest in the Islamic aspects of Turkey's past and present. Again Atatürk's death could be seen to have acted as a catalyst in this context. Certain sections of the Turkish population of the early Republic at large apparently felt at a loss, liberated or separated as they had suddenly become from the social regulations offered by the religion of Islam. The publication of guide-books for proper conduct regarding pious duties as prayer, such as the *Namaz Hocası ve Namaz Süreleri* (1944), would seem to suggest the validity of this contention.<sup>189</sup> The guide's author, Muharrem Zeki Korgunal, admonishes believers that the act of prayer was a 'sacred obligation' to be observed by everyone.<sup>190</sup> In addition, the little guide also details the different movements required and the exact times of each prayer session.<sup>191</sup> On a popular level, such governmental actions as the promulgation of the *Varlık Vergisi* (Wealth Tax, 11 November 1942-15 March 1944) enacted by the Şükrü Saraçoğlu administration, attempted to capitalise on a popular perception of Turkish national identity as being intimately linked with adherence to Islam. The taxation measure was aimed at combating war profiteering, but as pointed out by Cemil Koçak, its application turned out to be 'rather different'.<sup>192</sup> The government behaved leniently towards Muslim Turks in imposing the new tax burden, but did not display a similar flexibility towards members of the non-Muslim minorities, who still played an important role in the nation's economy at the time.

The issue of adhering to secularist principles was and still seems to be closely connected to the cult of personality that arose around the figure of Atatürk.<sup>193</sup> In the *Millî Şefera*, when Atatürk was no longer a living presence, the intellectual mood had clearly swayed towards a re-appreciation of the Islamic component of Turkish identity, as symbolised in a heightened visibility of aspects of

the Ottoman heritage. The *TTK*'s publishing policy, as well as the fact that the prestigious Turkish History Congresses, manifestations of the Kemalist approach to historical culture, now explicitly dealt with the Ottomans are both indicative of this high-level change.

The end of the Second World War marked an important juncture in the Turks' intellectual appreciation of the Republic's identity and its role in the wider world. For example, the writer and politician Tahsin Demiray, active in such right-wing organisations as first *Türkiye Köylü Partisi* and subsequently *Adalet Partisi*, writing in the preface of İsmail Hami Danişmend's *İzablı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi* (1947), records a significant declaration in this context.<sup>194</sup> Demiray talks about the fact that Turkey, in the guise of the Ottoman Empire, had once been a dominant world-power: '[p]reviously, we were [the] dominant [force] in the World Order ("Nizâm-ı Âlem") . . .'.<sup>195</sup> Particularly significant is Demiray's usage of the Islamic phrase 'Nizâm-ı Âlem' complete with Persian *izâfet*, emphasising the archaic value-system advocated. Demiray was writing in the aftermath of the war and the constitution of NATO. He seems to have been envisaging Turkey's rapprochement to the Western camp and Turkey's important role as the West's gate-keeper against the Soviet Union.<sup>196</sup> Demiray optimistically proclaims Turkey's regained importance in global affairs again employing the same archaic *izâfet*: 'we are again required to fulfil our historical duty in the World Order'.<sup>197</sup>

Positioning himself on a purely academic and scholarly plane, Danişmend himself notes an important declaration well worth quoting in full:

Research concerning various stages in Ottoman history is continually advancing, [and] every day new documents are found and a whole range of obscure issue . . . are continually being discussed and shall always be from now on.<sup>198</sup>

İsmail Hami Danişmend here speaks about the practice of Ottoman historiography as if the declaration of the *Türk Tarih Tezi* in 1932 had never taken place. In a way, one could claim that Danişmend made a prophetic statement with regard to the popularity of Ottoman history in Turkey at the close of the twentieth century and at the beginning of the twenty-first. But against the background of the extreme reaction against Ottoman topics in the previous decade (1930s), Danişmend's words mark a remarkable shift in Turkey's position.

The re-appropriation of the Ottomans in the *Millî Şefera* operated on numerous levels. On a purely internal stratum, the revived interest in the Ottomans symbolised the renewed entry of Islam into the political discourse of Turkey.<sup>199</sup> On a more global level, the government-fostered re-acquaintance

with the Ottoman centuries led to a heightened sense of self-esteem within the Turks in relation to the nations of the West, heirs as they were to the once world-dominating Ottomans. The *TTK*'s interpretation of the 'Tulip Age' as the ultimate beginning of a policy of Westernisation can be seen to function within Turkey's desire to take its place at the side of Europe and America in the inter-bloc rivalry of the Cold War emerging at the time. The promulgation of the Marshall Aid programme, and the development of NATO as a community of nations opposed to the dissemination of world communism provide the wider context of the decision to see the era of Damad İbrahim as the earliest precursor of the *Tanzimat* and arguably of the sweeping reforms introduced by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his followers.

### The Perception of the *Tanzimat*

It is interesting to delineate the way in which the *Tanzimat*'s perception of the early eighteenth century differs from the Republican rehabilitation of Damad İbrahim and the 'Tulip Age'. The *vakanüvis* and statesman Ahmed Cevdet, an exponent of the reform-minded Ottomans of the *Tanzimat*, condemned İbrahim Paşa as a statesman who had actively hampered the emergence of a sustained reform movement. Basing his insights on Şemdanizâde Süleyman Efendi's manuscript, Cevdet painted a picture of Damad İbrahim which showed the Grand Vezir to have been too pre-occupied with his personal and private delights and pleasures to promulgate serious policies. According to Cevdet, İbrahim Paşa did not possess the unity of purpose needed for initiating a sustained reform policy that would have alleviated Ottoman difficulties. As pointed out by Christoph Neumann, Ahmed Cevdet was the first history writer to champion the cause of Selim III as the initiator of an Ottoman *réveil* at the close of the eighteenth century. He tried to portray Selim III as an exceptional individual, an Ottoman sultan concerned with his state, army and people. By contrast, his predecessors, such as the well-known ('meşhûr') Damad İbrahim Paşa, active under Ahmed III, had been pleasure-headed individuals more concerned with their self-interest and the pursuit of transient pleasures expressed by the Ottoman phrase *zevk ü sefâ*. In 1270/1854 Ahmed Cevdet, acting on behalf of the *Encümen-i Daniş*, thus performed the role of a mouthpiece for the reformers of the *Tanzimat*, assigning Damad İbrahim to the role of a major culprit who had hindered the Ottomans in their quest for a modern and progressive state and society.<sup>200</sup>

This negative verdict on Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim Paşa is completely contradicted by the Kemalist establishment's re-appraisal voiced in 1940. The first two decades of the Republic's existence had not seen any major attempts to deal with Ottoman subjects. Instead, there was a deliberate concentration on ancient

history and archaeological research. The vacuum thus created was suddenly filled by the Education Minister Hasan Âli Yücel whose refined cultural sense was commensurate to the complex atmosphere of the *Millî Şefera* (1938-1950). His decision to commemorate the anniversary of the *Tanzimat*'s proclamation was of a seminal importance in determining the way in which the Republic was to present itself to the world at large. This government-sponsored re-appreciation of nineteenth-century Ottomans also entailed a foray into earlier periods, notably the eighteenth century. Enver Ziya Karal, as a member of the overtly Kemalist University of İstanbul and of the *TTK*, was the first Republican voice to propose a wholeheartedly positive reading of the era of Damad İbrahim, employing the phrase *Lâle Devri*. Rather than claiming that Damad İbrahim Paşa had initiated reform policies, Karal suggested that the Damad's tenure as Grand Vezir coincided with a societal and social change that saw the adoption of a 'new' and tolerant attitude allowing the West to enter mainstream Ottoman thinking. This claim led Karal to postulate that Ahmed III, and not Selim III, had stood at the ultimate root of a reform movement that was to culminate in the proclamation of the *Tanzimat*. The rehabilitation of Damad İbrahim was to supersede purely historical narratives and historiographical discussions of the value of Ottoman reform movements in the decades to come. But the end result was nevertheless that the Republic of Turkey appropriated an Ottoman statesman as the first example of a Turkish man who advocated the adoption of a tolerant and unprejudiced attitude towards the West.





# Epilogue

## The Politics of History, 1908-50

La vérité est l'ame d'Histoire, si les faits en sont  
le corps: sans elle l'Historien devient le  
méprisable auteur d'un Roman.

'Epitre', 22. Decembre 1742, in  
D. Cantemir, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*\*

I have investigated the image of Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim Paşa represented by the phrase 'Tulip Age' in various historiographical productions from the early twentieth century onward. The fertile ground for intellectual debate that was the Second Constitutional era of the Ottoman Empire (1908-18) also saw the development of important historiographical discourses. An independent author such as Ahmed Râsim ensured the survival of some of the nineteenth-century preconceptions surrounding Damad İbrahim and his links with the cultivation and the enjoyment of tulips as well as with the pursuit of a hedonistic lifestyle. These moral judgements had been put forward in Mustafa Nuri's *Netâyic ül-Vukûât* (1294/1877) and in the first volume of the prestigious *Tarih-i Cevdet* (1270/1854). The latter-mentioned work by Ahmed Cevdet must carry the largest responsibility for the popularity of the negative portrayal of Damad İbrahim as an Ottoman Vezir unable to uphold the military health of the state, and instead inclined towards the pursuit of transient pleasures as represented by the Ottoman phrase *Zevk ü Sefâ*.

Ahmed Cevdet as well as Mustafa Nuri appear to have grounded their moral outrage upon the descriptions contained in the manuscript *Mür'î't-Tevarih*, compiled in the late eighteenth century by Şemdânîzâde Süleyman Efendi as a *zeyl* to Kâtib Çelebi's *Takvimü't-Tevarih*. Şemdânîzâde accused Damad İbrahim of wilfully misdirecting the Ottoman state away from its pursuit of military excellence, and of guiding the population into following his example of self-indulgence and sexual permissiveness.

At the same time, other apparently less independent voices, for example the Hungarian honorary member of the government-sponsored *TOE*, Imre Karacson, published views which depict Damad İbrahim as an Ottoman ruler who

had been closely concerned with the fate of the Empire. Karacsón even claimed that İbrahim Paşa had attempted to introduce samples of the progressive technology of the West, in the shape of a printing press, into the scientifically backward Ottoman sphere. The chairman of the *TOE*, Abdurrahman Şeref, had at the end of the nineteenth century propounded similar opinions in his *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniyye*, intended for use in classrooms of the İdâdiyye schools. In claiming that Damad İbrahim had initiated a close interaction between east and west, Abdurrahman Şeref possibly followed the lead of the Austrian Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall. J.-J. Hellert's French translation of Hammer's multi-volume opus contains the phrase 'a marked influence of occidental habits on those of the Orient',<sup>1</sup> as characterising the impact of the establishment of a printing press in the İstanbul of the 1720s. This sentence seems to have induced the Ottoman historian to reconsider Damad İbrahim's ill-smelling reputation.

In the end, at the outset of the twentieth century two rather contradictory images of Damad İbrahim appeared to have currency in the Turkish press. These two positions were reconciled in the work of Ahmed Refik Altınay. Ahmed Refik was a member of the *TOE*, the government-sponsored society that aimed to purvey an objective account of Ottoman history, but which nevertheless remained beholden to the state's Ottomanist ideology. Ahmed Refik was a prolific writer of numerous historical studies published in a wide variety of periodical publications, but he also wrote numerous books dealing with historical topics.

As an historian fluent in French and conversant with contemporary French historiography, Ahmed Refik translated a theoretical work written by the statesman and historian Gabriel Hanotaux: *Tarih ve Müverrihler* (1928).<sup>2</sup> Even though this book is admittedly a translation, it nevertheless offers an insight into Ahmed Refik's own stance on issues of historiographical representation and methodology. Its text maintains that history should be practised as an art form, but that the artistic side of historical composition should be combined with scientific rigour and methodology, in the sense of applying a strict form of source criticism and ensuring a solid adherence to a sound chronology.<sup>3</sup> In other words, the book proposes combining a positivist methodology with romantic notions of an aesthetic value scale ('the aim of history is beauty').<sup>4</sup> The book is adamant in proclaiming the essentially narrative nature of the craft of history writing: '[a] historian is a storyteller . . . The mission of history is to tell [the story] of the events of the past in a lively manner'.<sup>5</sup> In the *Perşembe Dergisi* interview conducted by Feridun Kandemir, Ahmed Refik unequivocally proclaims that '[h]istory is an art . . . [a]nd science is its helper'.<sup>6</sup> Ahmed Refik thus proved himself a true exponent of the nineteenth-century school of historiographic composition.<sup>7</sup>

Ahmed Refik's *Lâle Devri* is a text that operated on a number of levels during the Second Constitutional period. On a purely pragmatic plane his text attempted to dislodge the moral opprobrium attached to Damad İbrahim in the Turkish press as a result of Ahmed Cevdet's unfavourable depiction of the latter years of Ahmed III's reign. Ahmed Cevdet transformed the discourse of tulip cultivation and the numerous festivities involving the display of tulips that had pervaded early eighteenth-century İstanbul, into a shorthand for moral decay and military weakness. In contrast, Ahmed Refik used the *topos* of tulip cultivation, and festivities involving tulips, as an attractive point of entry to talk about Damad İbrahim as an able and popular administrator. He described these tulip-inspired diversions as glorious occasions bestowing honour upon the Ottomans. Ahmed Refik cunningly used these colourful occasions to suggest that early eighteenth-century İstanbul had been engulfed by a positive mentality conducive to the introduction of new forms and ideas. Ahmed Refik employed the works of Charles Schefer, Albert Vandal and Auguste Boppe as sources proving that his protagonist had been in close contact with the West.<sup>8</sup> He even utilised Tayyârzâde Ahmed Atâ's hagiographic description of Damad İbrahim as a pious and duty-bound yet open-minded statesman to claim that the early eighteenth-century Ottoman Vezir had attempted to introduce far-reaching military reforms, inserting the term *Nizâm-ı Cedid* into his text. *Lâle Devri* thus combines İbrahim Paşa's Ottoman reputation as a patron of tulips with the verdict of European historians basing themselves on Hammer's optimistic appraisal of the reign of Ahmed III.

Ahmed Refik's anachronistic description of the Grand Vezir fulfils a number of functions. During the Second Constitutional era the Ottoman Empire attempted to be part of the European system of nations, and Ahmed Refik's text discloses an early precedent in the policies promulgated by Damad İbrahim. At the same time, however, the newly-discovered freedom in early twentieth-century 'Turkey' led to a vibrant intellectual climate, allowing the development of public debates and discussions on a wide variety of issues. Islam as a political concept was a particularly potent issue in view of then current attempts to introduce far-reaching reforms entailing the adoption of the European example. In particular, the issue of *medrese* curricula received a great deal of popular attention. *Lâle Devri* depicted traditional, pre-constitutional Ottoman society as a stagnant entity when reactionary members of the *ulema*, graduates of the backward *medrese* system, had a tight grip over the population. He consequently claimed that bigotry and ignorance had been rife amongst wide swathes of the population. Ahmed Refik ended his narrative of the progressive Grand Vezir attempting to introduce innovations from the West into the backward Ottoman system with a biased account of the Patrona Halil rebellion ending Ahmed III's reign in 1730. Apparently basing himself on Hammer's reading of the *Tarih-i*

*Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî*, Ahmed Refik charged two members of the *ulema* with organising the rebellion. In later publications he expanded on this theme, clearly pointing towards the issue of *medrese* reform as a beneficial factor in the Ottoman Empire's attempts to introduce innovation into a stagnant and retrogressive system. In the year 1332/1917-18, he also managed to link his main protagonist İbrahim Paşa with the terms *Tanzimat* and 'Renaissance', further insinuating his exceptional status as an Ottoman ahead of his time.

In the 1930s, Hasan Âli Yücel coined the term *telmihî tarih* (allusive history) to describe Ahmed Refik's methodology of employing the past to comment upon the present. As a result, casting aside any partisan sympathies for the historian as a contributor to the lively intellectual debates of early twentieth-century 'Turkey', it seems that Ahmed Refik's presentism was widely acknowledged by his contemporaries. The term 'Whiggish history', as coined by Herbert Butterfield in 1931,<sup>9</sup> seems apt to describe the methodological practice of Ahmed Refik. Butterfield saw a 'tendency' to 'praise the precursor' and to 'blame the backward' as characteristic of a Whiggish interpretation of historical events. He particularised this stance as follows: 'certain principles of progress in the past [are emphasised] . . . to produce a story which is the ratification if not the glorification of the present'.<sup>10</sup>

In his *Lâle Devri*, Ahmed Refik produced a narrative that shows Damad İbrahim as the precursor of Ottomans exhibiting modern and progressive attitudes, such as were to populate the Empire following the proclamation of the *Tanzimat*. Opposing the Damad's beneficial policies were the backward masses led by bigoted *ulema*, and aided by reactionary Janissaries fearing for their livelihoods. As one of the issues occupying public opinion during the 1910s had been the reform of the institution of the *medrese*, Ahmed Refik's *Lâle Devri* provided a vivid example of the dangers posed by a religious establishment out of step with the developments in government circles and intellectual milieus. Ahmed Refik thus constructed a narrative which contained clear advice for the current ruling élite. The culmination of the 'Tulip Age' in the Patrona Halil rebellion betrays his underlying concerns to paint a moral tale admonishing his audience not to delay reforming the way in which *medrese* graduates instructed the population about issues such as faith and modernity. As expressed by Hayden White, '[t]he demand for closure in the historical story is a demand . . . for moral meaning, a demand that sequences of real events be assessed as to their significance as elements of a moral drama'.<sup>11</sup> Earlier accounts of the Patrona Halil rebellion had contained allegations of *ulema* involvement as well, attributing this to their disapproval of the hedonism of the Ottoman élite. Ahmed Refik, however, utilised these narrative traditions to insinuate that Damad İbrahim as Grand Vezir (1718-30) had been an early proponent of the idea of modernisation along European lines, an idea that was in common currency dur-

ing the Second Constitutional or Young Turk era of the Ottoman Empire (1908-18).

Ahmed Refik's vigorous defence of Damad İbrahim in the period 1913-19 led to a popular recognition of the term 'Tulip Age'. Following the end of the First World War and during the first decade of the Republic's existence, the phrase 'Tulip Age' entered the popular imagination as a codeword signifying decadent pursuits, which attests to a revival of nineteenth-century notions. The writings of such popular authors as Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın], Dr. Rıfât Osman, and Refik Ahmed [Sevengil] further popularised the idea that Damad İbrahim had primarily supervised an era of dissipation and frivolity. In contrast, the texts written by Ali Canib [Yöntem] and Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek] took up Ahmed Refik's stance. In particular Selim Nüzhet's book written to commemorate the bi-centenary of the establishment of a [Muslim] printing press in 'Turkey' (*Türk Matbaacılığı*) was to have a profound impact on the historiographical establishment of the Republic in years to come.

At the time of publication in 1928, however, historians seem to have ignored the book in spite of Necip Asım [Yazıksız]'s favourable review published in 1929. The aim of the book was to praise the introduction of the printing press as the beginning of a 'Renaissance in Turkey' ('*intibâh devri – rönesâns*'), similar to historical circumstances in Europe where Gutenberg's invention accompanied such momentous shifts in cultural development as the Renaissance and the Reformation. In the process of ascribing such beneficial traits to Müteferrika's enterprise, Selim Nüzhet also passed a positive judgement on İbrahim Paşa. Perhaps as a result of his journalistic background, Selim Nüzhet did not shy away from fabricating a sentence that he presented as one of the instructions ('*talimât*') given to the Ottoman ambassador Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi. Selim Nüzhet arguably based his sentence on some of Ali Suavi's words in the preface to his Paris edition of Mehmed Efendi's *Takrir*, and on the contemporary chronicler Râşid Mehmed's descriptive assessment of Yirmisekiz Çelebi. This 'instruction' supposedly recorded by Selim Nüzhet, which has entered the literary corpus on Yirmisekiz Çelebi as the phrase 'to make a thorough study of the means of civilization and education, and report on those capable of application' in Turkey, in Bernard Lewis's translation, was ignored throughout the 1930s. In this period, the official history of Turkey was rewritten according to the precepts of the History Thesis, which led to numerous archaeological expeditions and an acute interest in ancient history. The *TTK*, as Turkey's official historiographical establishment, encouraged the rediscovery and appropriation of the remains of the ancient civilisation of the Hittites, who had occupied Anatolia during the Bronze Age. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's personal involvement with such issues as historical culture and identity politics in contemporary Turkey led to neglecting the Ottoman centuries of Turkish history.

After Atatürk's death in 1938, and İsmet İnönü's assumption of power, Turkey went through a gradual reconciliation with certain aspects of Turkey's Ottoman-Islamic past and identity. In 1940 this led to the publication of a grand volume to commemorate the proclamation of the *Tanzimat* a century earlier. This was an effort under the auspices of Hasan Âli Yücel, the then Minister for Culture and Education (*Maarif Vekili*). The volume contained a great many seminal pieces that were to leave their mark on the writings of future Turkish historians. With regard to the 'Tulip Age', Enver Ziya Karal's piece on the long-term precursors of the *Tanzimat* proved pivotal. Karal appropriated Ahmed Refik's interpretation of the *Lâle Devri* as the ultimate origin of reform movements which culminated in the proclamation of the *Tanzimat* in 1839. An important element in Karal's confident declaration appears to be his reliance on Selim Nüzhet Gerçek's *Türk Matbaacılığı*. Karal reproduced Gerçek's supposed 'record' of one of the instructions given to Yirmisekiz Çelebi as proof of the fact that the Ottoman ruling élite had been willing to engage constructively with the West during the 'Tulip Age'. Karal additionally called upon the well-respected authority of İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı to support the view that Damad İbrahim's strategy had been a precursor of a new trend in Ottoman policy. A couple of years later, Yücel's far-reaching translation programmes led to the composition of a Turkish version of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, in which Enver Ziya Karal wrote the entry on 'Ahmed III (1673-1736)'. His pronouncements on the progressive nature of the latter part of Ahmed III's reign went considerably further in this short piece. Karal declared that during the 'Tulip Age' the Ottomans had started to turn away from the restrictions of Islam, and to concentrate on worldly delights. In the Republic there had been an analogous development during the previous decades, as symbolised in the proclamation that the consumption of spirits and alcohol was legal for the citizens of the Republic of Turkey (1926).

At the time the government of the Republic of Turkey clearly approved of such a reinterpretation of the notion of the 'Tulip Age'. Enver Ziya Karal had become a full member of the *TTK*, and his texts detailing the official adoption of the phrase as a new way of interpreting a certain part of Turkey's Ottoman history were published by the *Maarif Vekâleti*.

Ahmed Refik's narrative which responded to the demands of the Second Constitutional era had thus been successfully transformed into a tenet of the Republican understanding of Turkey's history. This signalled the renewed entry of the Ottomans into historical narratives produced and published in Kemalist Turkey. Karal's texts did not correspond to a narrative approach to history, as they had been short explanatory pieces written for specific purposes – the commemoration of the *Tanzimat* and an encyclopaedia entry respectively. In their limited way, these pieces nevertheless replicated the narrative movement of

Ahmed Refik's book, the story of Damad İbrahim as a reformer finding its conclusion in the rebellion of Patrona Halil. They dislocated Ahmed Refik's text from its context, namely the public debates enveloping early twentieth-century İstanbul. Karal's pieces presented the twelve years of Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* from the standpoint of post-Atatürk Republican Turkey. For example, in this completely different era the issue of *medrese* reform, which had so strongly influenced Ahmed Refik, had become purely academic. Karal's texts were intended as a reflection of the historical reality of the period 1718-30. In Karal's pieces the denomination 'Tulip Age' functioned as a code implying Westernisation, modernisation and progress. The narrative of the 'Tulip Age' was held to represent the historical reality of early eighteenth-century İstanbul. One could thus, borrowing Hayden White's words, posit that '[p]olitical partisanship and moral prejudice' led Turkish historians from Ahmed Refik, in the Constitutional Era, to Enver Ziya Karal, in the Kemalist Republic, 'to misread or misrepresent documents and thus to construct events that never took place'.<sup>12</sup> After all, one should never forget that the past is something which does not exist apart from a few traces and the historian's imagination, an imagination which is subject to his or her rhetorical, metaphorical and ideological strategies of explanation.

I have thus attempted to ascertain patterns of inter-textuality, patterns that sanctioned historians to compose representations of early eighteenth-century İstanbul in line with concerns current at the time of writing. I have attempted to show that these various texts were not reflections of the past, but rather narratives operating within the framework of textual composition. Most scholars, active in the second half of the twentieth century and beyond, have accepted the idea of a 'Tulip Age' as corresponding to the historical reality of the *sadâret* of Damad İbrahim, influenced by the important work of Bernard Lewis and Niyazi Berkes. This has led to a proliferation of studies stressing the 'otherness' of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim in an Ottoman context. The thorough investigation of the source material employed by these authors, however, suggests that the *topos* of the pro-Western and reformist Ottomans of the 'Tulip Age' should be understood as a literary creation that does not necessarily mirror the historical reality of 1718-30.





# Bibliography

## Abbreviations

AAD	Akademik Arařtırmalar Dergisi
AO	Archivum Ottomanicum
BÜ	Bilim ve Ütopya
DBİA	Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi
DWDI	Die Welt des Islams
EI	Encyclopaedia of Islam
İÜİFM	İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası
IJMES	International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies
JFBC	Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center
JMH	Journal of Modern History
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
KAM	Kubbealtı Akademisi Mecmuası
K-K	Kuram-Kitap
LTK	La Turquie Kemaliste
MDOG	Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
MES	Middle Eastern Studies
TD	Türk Dili
TDED	Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi
TDVİA	Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi
TM	Türkiyat Mecmuası
TOEM	Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuası
TTEM	Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası
TSY	Topkapı Sarayı Yıllığı
TT	Toplumsal Tarih
TV	Tarih Vesikaları
TvT	Tarih ve Toplum

## Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Sources: Ottoman and European

Abdurrahman Şeref, *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniyye* (Dersaadet: Kurrebet Matbaası, 1315/1897-98).

*Ahmed Cevdet Paşa: Tarih-i Cevdet*, 12 vols (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1270-1301/1854-84).

*Ahmed Cevdet Paşa: Tarih-i Cevdet*, ed. Dünder Günday (İstanbul: Sabah, 1972).

- Ahmed Vefik, *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Osmanî* (Dersaadet: Matbaa-ı Âmiré, 1286/1869).
- Armingaud, J., *Venise et le le Bas-Empire. Histoire des relations de Venise avec l'Empire d'Orient* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1868).
- Atâ, Tayyarzâde Ahmed, *Tarih-i Atâ*, 5 vols (İstanbul, 1293/1876).
- Blanc, Charles, *Les peintres des fêtes galantes. Watteau, Lancret, Pater, Boucher* (Paris: J. Renouard, 1854).
- Burckhardt, Jacob, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, 2 vols, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., (Leipzig: A. Kröner, 1885).
- Burckhardt, Jacob, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, transl. S. G. C. Middlemore (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990).
- Cantemir, Demetrius, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, où se voyent les causes de son aggrandissement et de sa décadence*, transl. M. de Jonckquieres, 4 vols (Paris: J.-N. Le Clerc, 1743).
- Charmes, Gabriel, *L'avenir de la Turquie: le panislamisme* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1883).
- Chénier, Louis de, *Révolutions de l'Empire Ottoman, Et observations sur ses progrès, sur ses revers, & sur l'état présent de cet Empire* (Paris: l'auteur, 1789).
- Esad Efendi, Mehmed, *Vakanüvis Es'ad Efendinin Tarihi*, ed. Z. Yılmaz (İstanbul: Osmanlı Arastirmaları Vakfı, 2000).
- Goncourt, Edmond and Jules de, *L'art du XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1896).
- Hadikat ül-Vüzerâ* (İstanbul, 1271/1854-5), facsimile ed. (Freiburg: D. Robischon, 1969).
- Hammer, Joseph de, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman: depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours*, 18 vols, (Paris: Bellizard, Barthès, Dufour & Lowell, 1835-43).
- Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, grossentheils auf bisher unbenützten Handschriften und Archiven*, 10 vols, (Pest, 1827-35).
- Kâtib Çelebi, *Takvim üt-Tevârih* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmiré, 1146/1733).
- L'architecture Ottomane, ouvrage autorisé par iradé impérial, et publié sous le patronage de Son Excellence Edhem Pacha, pour l'Exposition Universelle de 1873 à Vienne*, ed. Edhem Paşa, (Constantinople, Imprimerie et Lithographie Centrales, 1873).
- Laugier, Abbé Marc-Antoine, *Histoire des négociations pour la paix conclue à Belgrade, le 18 septembre 1739, entre l'Empereur, la Russie et la Porte ottomane, par la médiation et sous la garantie de la France*, 2 vols, (Paris: Vve Duchesne, 1768).

- Mémoires sur l'ambassade de France en Turquie, 1525 - 1740, par François Emmanuel Guignard, Comte de Saint-Priest*, ed. Charles Schefer (Paris: E. Leroux, 1894) (Reprint Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1974).
- Mercure de France* (June 1724, Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1969).
- Michelet, Jules, *Histoire de la France*, 19 vols, revised ed. (Paris: Marpon & Flammarion, 1879).
- Mignot, Vincent, Abbé de Scellieres, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman depuis son origine jusqu'à la paix de Belgrade, en 1740*, 4 vols (Paris: Le Clerc, 1771).
- Mustafa Nuri, *Netâ'iyic ül-Vukûât*, 4 vols, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Uhuvvet Matbaası, 1327/1911).
- Mustafa Nuri Paşa: Netâ'iyic ül-vukuat. Kurum ve örgütleriyle Osmanlı Tarihi*, 4 vols, ed. Neşet Çağatay (Ankara: TTK, 1979).
- Müteferrika, İbrahim, *Usûl ül-Hikem fi Nizâm ül-Ümem* (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Âmire, 1144/1732).
- Namık Kemal, Mehmed, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, new ed. (İstanbul, 1326/1910-11).
- Namık Kemal'in Şairliği ve Bütün Şiirleri*, ed. Önder Göçgün (Ankara: AKM, 1999).
- Omont, Henri, 'Inventaire de manuscrits grecs et latins donnés à Saint-Marc de Venise (1468)' in *Revue des Bibliothèques*, IV (1894), pp. 129-87.
- Omont, Henri, 'Documents sur l'imprimerie à Constantinople au XVIIIe siècle' in *Revue des Bibliothèques*, V, (1895).
- Râşid, Mehmed Efendi, *Tarih-i Râşid*, 6 vols, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Âmire, 1282/1865).
- Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'Empire ottoman*, 4 vols, ed. Gabriel effendi Noradounghian (Paris: F. Pichon, 1897-1903).
- Rouvroy, Louis de, Duc de Saint-Simon, *Mémoires complets et authentiques*, 41 vols ed. Marquis de Saint Simon (Paris: A. Sautet et cie, 1879-1929).
- Salaberry, M. de, *Histoire de L'Empire Ottoman depuis sa fondation jusqu'à la paix d'Yassi en 1792*, 4 vols (Paris: Le Normant, 1813)
- Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Ottoman Statecraft. The Book of Counsel for Vezirs and Governors*, ed. W. L. Wright, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1935).
- Seignobos, Charles, *Histoire de la civilisation au moyen âge et dans les temps modernes* (Paris: Masson et cie, 1887).
- Şem'dânî-zâde Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi Târihi Mür'it-Tevârih I*, ed. M. M. Aktepe (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1976).
- Toderini, Giambattista, *De la littérature des Turcs*, 3 vols (Paris: Chez Poinçot, 1789).
- Vandal, L. J. Albert, *Le pacha Bonneval* (Paris: L. Cerf, 1885).

- Vandal, L. J. Albert, *Une ambassade française en orient sous Louis XV, la mission du marquis de Villeneuve 1728-1741* (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et cie., 1887).
- Vandal, L. J. Albert, *L'odyssée d'un ambassadeur. Les voyages du Marquis de Nointel, (1670-1680)* (Paris, 1900).
- Vetter, Theodor, *Johann Rudolf Schmid. Freiherr von Schwarzenborn. Nachrichten über sein Leben und Wirken* (Frauenfeld, 1890).
- Waliszewski, Kazimierz, *Pierre le Grand*, 2 vols (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit & Cie., 1897).
- Yirmisekiz Çelebi, *Tacryr ou relation de Mohammed Effendi Ambassadeur par la S. Porte en France 1720*, ed. Suavi Effendi (Paris: V. Goupy, 1872).
- Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi'nin Fransa Sefâretnâmesi*, ed. B. Akyavaş (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Arastırma Enstitüsü, 1993).

### Turkish Sources: Constitutional Era and Period of Armistice

- Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni hakkında Talimât Süreti' in *TOEM*, I, 1 (1-14 April 1326/1910), p.5.
- Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Viyana Sefir-i Sâbiki Hüseyin Hilmi Paşa' in *TOEM*, IX-XIII (1 April 1335/1919 - 1 June 1337/1921), pp. 63-74.
- Ahmed Râsim, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 4 vols (İstanbul, 1910-12).
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, *Küçük Tarih-i Osmanî* (Istanbul: Kitabhane-i İslam ve Askeri, 1327/1911-12).
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, 'Ahmed-i Sâlis Devrinde Osmanlı Hanımları' in *Şebbal*, III, 53 (15 May 1912/1328).
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, 'Ahmed-i Sâlis Devrinde Sultan Dügünleri. Bir Sultanın Hissiyatı' in *Şebbal*, III, 54 (1 June 1328/1912).
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, *Büyük Tarih-i Umûmî*, 4 vols (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Orhaniye, 1328/1912).
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, 'Moralî Âli Efendinin Pâris Sefâreti (1797-1802)' in *TOEM*, III, (1328/1912), pp.1120-37.
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, *Osmanlı Tarihine Dâir Nefer Ne Bilmelidir* (İstanbul, 1328/1912-13).
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, 'Lâle Devri' in *İkdam*, no. 5763 (9 March 1913), p. 2.
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, 'Lâle Devri' in *İkdam*, no. 5767 (13 March 1913), p. 2.
- [Altunay], Ahmed Refik, *Muhtasar Osmanlı Tarihi*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası, 1330/1914-15).

- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Kabakçı Mustafa* (İstanbul: Kitabhâne-i Askeri, 1331/1915).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Lâle Devri (1130-1143)*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Muhtar Halit Kütürphanesi, 1331/1915).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Tarihî Simâlar* (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1331/1915-16).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Felâket Seneleri (1094-1110)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Kitabhâne-i Askeri, 1332/1916-7).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Memâlik-i Osmaniyyede Demirbaş Şarl* (İstanbul: Hilâl Matbaası, 1332/1916-7).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Damad İbrahim Paşa ve Aleyhdârları (1-6)' in *İkdam*, 7485, 7487, 7489, 7491-2, 7494 (13, 15, 17, 19-20, 22 December 1917).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Padişahlarımızda Din Gayreti ve Vatan Muhabbeti* (s. l., 1332/1916-17).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Memâlik-i Osmaniyyede Kirâl Râkôci ve Tevâbii (1109-1154)* (İstanbul: Hilâl Matbaası, 1333/1917).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Onikinci Asr-ı Hicride İlk Osmanlı Matbaası (1-3)' in *İkdam*, 7218, 7236, 7250 (16 March 1333/1917, 3 April 1333/1917, 17 April 1333/1917).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa Türkdü ve Müslümandı' in *İkdam*, 7477 (5 December 1333/1917), p. 1.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Sultan Ahmed-i Sâlis Çeşmeleri' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 27 (10 January 1918), pp. 9-12.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Sultan Ahmed-i Sâlis ve Damadı' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 34 (7 March 1918), p. 149-52.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Pasarofça Müsalâhası Akd Edilirken ... Mart 1718 - Mart 1918' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 35 (14 March 1918), pp. 169-72.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda Ecnebi Ressamlar: Vânmûr, Hiler' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 40 (18 April 1918), pp. 269-72.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Tarihde Hoca Nüfûzu (1-22)' in *İkdam*, 8155-81 (25 October - 21 November 1919).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Kafkas Yollarında/İki Komite İki Kutâl*, ed. Osman Selim Kocahanoglu (İstanbul: Temel, 1998).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Hilâfet Meselesi ve Yeni Türkiye' in *İkdam*, no. 9210 (7 November 1338/1922), p. 3.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Fatma Sultan. Garyri Matbû Vesikalara Nazaran Yazılmışdır* (İstanbul: Diken ve İnci Matbaası, s.d.). '671 Senelik Muazzam Osmanlı Devleti' in *İkdam*, nr.8220 (31 December 1335/1919), p. 1.

- [Arseven], Celâl Esad, *Eski Galata ve Mebânileri* (İstanbul, 1329/1913).
- [Çığıraçan], İbrahim Hilmi, *Maarifimiz ve Servet-i İlmîyyemiz Felâket-lerimizin Esbâbı* (Dersaadet: Kitabhâne-i Islâm ve Askeriyye, 1329/1913).
- [Duru], Kâzım Nami, 'Türkçe mi, Osmanlıca mı?' in *Genç Kalemler Dergisi* (1910-12), eds. İ. Parlatır and N. Çetin (Ankara: TDK, 1999).
- Ebüzzîya Tevfik, 'Türklük ve Tatarlık Bahsı' in *Mecmûa-ı Ebüzzîya*, XXX, 94 (5 Cemazıyelevvel 1329/4 May 1911).
- Fatma Aliye, 'Şiir ve Kadın' in *İkdam*, 7459 (17 November 1917).  
Quoted in Muzaffer Gökman, *Tarihi Sevdiren Adam*, p. 343, no.729.1
- Gökalp, [Mehmed] Ziyâ, *Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (İstanbul: Evkaf-ı İslâmiyye Matbaası, 1918).
- Kâmil Paşa, Kıbrıslı Mehmed, *Tarih-i Siyâsî-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmanîyye: teessüs-ı Devlet-i Âliyeden cennet-mekân Sultan Abdülmecid Hanın evâbir-i saltanatına kadar güzêran eden zamana aiddir*, 3 vols (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ahmed İhsan, 1328/1325/1910).
- Karacsón, Imre [Doktor Karaçon], 'İbrahim Müteferrika' in *TOEM*, I, 3 (1-14 August 1326/1911), pp.178-85.
- Osman Nuri, *Abdülhamid-i Sâni ve Devr-i Saltanatı. Hayat-ı husûsiyyesi*, 3 vols (İstanbul Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1327/1911).
- Pontus Meselesi. Arap alfabetesinden aktarılan, notlu ve tenkitli şekilde*, ed. Yusuf Gedikli (İstanbul: Bilge Karınca Yayınları, 2002).
- Rıfat Osman, Dr., *Edirne Sarayı*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., ed. A. Süheyl Ünver (Ankara: TTK, 1989).
- Seignobos, Charles: Tarih-i Medeniyet. Kurun-ı Vusta ve Ezmine-i Cedide*, 3 vols, ed. Ahmed Refik (İstanbul, 1328/1912).
- Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni, 'İfâde-i Merâm' in *TOEM*, I, 1 (1-14 April 1326/1910), pp. 1 - 8.

### Turkish Sources: Republican Era

- Abdurrahman Şeref, *Tarih Musâhabeleri* (İstanbul: Sabah Matbaası, 1339/1923).
- Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Sultan Abdülazizin Vefatı - İntihârımı, Katlı mı?' in *TTEM* XIV, 6 (83) (October 1340/1924), pp. 321-30.
- [Adıvar], Halide Edib, *Sinekli Bakkal*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Halit Kitabevi, 1942).
- Akal, Emel, *Milli Mücadele'nin Başlangıcında Mustafa Kemal, İttihat Terakki ve Bolşevizm* (İstanbul: Tüstav, 2002).

- Akşin, Sina (ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 4. Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1997).
- Akın, İ. F., *Türk Devrimi Tarihi*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın, 1992).
- Akün, Ömer Faruk, 'Osmanlı Tarihi Karşısında Yahya Kemal'in Şiiri' in *KAM*, V, 2 (1976).
- Akün, Ömer Faruk, 'Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar' in *TDED*, XII, 10, pp. 1-32.
- Albayrak, Hakan, *Kemalizm Terakkiye Mânidir* (Vadi Yayınları, 2004).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Damad İbrahim Paşa Zamanında Ürgüb ve Nevşehir' in *TTEM*, XIV, 3 (80) (May 1340/1924), pp. 156-185.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Tarihimizde Tekkeler ve Şeyhler' in *İkdam*, no. 10219 (18 September 1341/1925), p. 3.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Onikinci Asırda Medreseler' in *İkdam*, no. 10228 (27 September 1341/1925), p. 3.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman' in *TTEM*, XVI, 14 (91) (March 1926), pp. 69-78.
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih. Tarih-i Kadim-Kurûn-ı Vustâ* (İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası, 1926).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih. Kurûn-ı Kadim, Garb Kurûn-ı Vustâsı* (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Hilmi, 1928).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara Tarih Bilgisi. Kurunu vusta, Kurunu cedide* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitabhanesi, 1929).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *İlk Türk Matbaası* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1929).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Hicrî On İkinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1000-1100)* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Fransız Müverrihleri. Michelet. Lavisse. Vandal* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1932).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Lâle devri*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1932).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Osmanlı Devrinde Hoca Nüfûzu* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1933).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, 'Sümerlilerin kurduğu medeniyet ve tesirleri' in *Cumhuriyet*, (14 November 1935).
- [Altınay], Ahmed Refik, *Lâle Devri*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., (İstanbul, s.d.).
- Arıkan, Zeki, 'Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Tarihçilik' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, ed. Murat Belge (İstanbul: İletişim, 1985), vol. VI.
- Arıkan, Zeki, 'Hasan-Âli Yücel ve Tarih Bilinci' in *TvT*, 28, 166, (October 1997), pp. 4-12.



- Arsal, Sadri Maksudî, 'Teokratik Devlet ve Lâik Devlet' in *Tanzimat* (1940), pp. 59-95.
- [Arseven], Celâl Esad, *Türk Sanatı* (İstanbul: Akşam Matbaası, 1928).
- Arslan, Ali, *Darülfünun'dan Üniversite'ye* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1995).
- [Atay], Falih Rıfki, 'Ahmet Refik' in *Yedigün*, 5, 241 (20 October 1937), p. 4.
- Atay, Hüseyin, *Osmanlılarda Yüksek Din Eğitimi. Medrese Programları – İcazetnâmeler - Islahat Hareketleri* (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1983).
- Banoğlu, Niyazi Ahmed, *Nükte ve Fıkralarla Atatürk*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: İnkılap, 1978).
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, 'Türk Toprak Hukuku Tarihinde Tanzimat ve 1274 (1858) tarihli Arazi Kanunnamesi' in *Tanzimat* (1940), pp. 321-421.
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, 'Tanzimat Tetkiklerinin Ortaya Koyduğu Bazı Meseleler' in *İÜİFM*, II/2 (1941), pp. 288-329.
- Berktray, Halil, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü* (İstanbul: Kaynak yayınları, 1983).
- Beyatlı, Reşat, *Yahya Kemal'in Hayatı* (İstanbul?, 1959).
- Beyatlı, Yahya Kemal, *Eski Şiirin Rüzgârıyla* (İstanbul: Fetih Cemiyeti, 1962).
- Beyatlı, Yahya Kemal, *Siyasi ve Edebî Portreler* (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1968).
- Beyatlı, Yahya Kemal, *Çocukluğum, Gençliğim, Siyasi ve Edebî Hatıralarım* (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1986).
- Bilsel, Cemil, *İstanbul Üniversitesinin Tarihi* (İstanbul: İÜ Yayınları, 1943).
- 1730 Patrona İhtilâlı Hakkında Bir Eser: Abdi Tarihi*, ed. F. R. Unat (Ankara: TTK, 1943).
- Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi. Maarif Vekâleti ve Türk Tarihi tetkik Cemiyeti tarafından tertip edilmiştir* (Ankara, T.C. Maarif Vekâleti, 1932).
- [Bodrumlu], Avram Galanti, 'Türkiyede İlk Katolik Kapûsin Manastırları' in *TTEM*, XIV, 2 (79) (March 1340/1924), pp. 125-8.
- Copeaux, E., *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk-İslam Sentezine* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998).
- [Çambel] Hasan Cemil, 'Hars Tebdili' in *Yeni Ruh* (1929), pp. 96-102. Re-published in *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı II Atatürk Dizisi: 11*, eds Mehmet Kaplan et al., (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1981), pp. 6-7.
- Çehri, Bahriye, *Türk Romanında Kadın 1923-38 Dönemi* (İstanbul: Simurg, 1996).

- Çetin, A., 'Osmanlı Devlet Arşivi'nin Kuruluşu ve Tasnif Çalışmaları' in *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, 21 (December 1982), pp.98-102. Çıkar, Mustafa, *Hasan-Âli Yücel ve Kültür Reformu*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1998).
- Çöker, Fahri (ed.), *Türk Tarih Kurumu. Kuruluş Amacı ve Çalışmaları* (Ankara: TTK, 1983).
- Çukurova, Bülent, 'Tarikat-ı Salahiye Cemiyeti, Ankara İstiklal Mahkemesince Mahkum Edilmesi ve Sonrası' in *TvT*, XIII, 17 (1990), pp. 40-6.
- Danişmend, İsmail Hami, *İzablı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*, 4 vols (İstanbul: Türkiye Basımevi, 1947-55).
- Duman, D. and P. Duman, 'Kültürel Bir Değişim Aracı Olarak Güzellik Yarışmaları' in *TT*, 7, 42 (June 1997), pp. 20-6.
- IV. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 10 - 14 Kasım 1948* (Ankara: TTK, 1952).
- Duru, Kâzım Nami, *Kemalist Rejimde Öğretim ve Eğitim* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi, 1938).
- [Eldem], Halil Edhem, *Düvel-i İslâmiyye. Tarihi Medhaller ile Takvimi ve Ensâbi Cedvelleri Muhtevidir* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1345/1927).
- [Eldem], Halil Ethem, *Topkapı Sarayı* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1931).
- Eldem, Sedat Hakkı, *Sa'dabad* (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Türk San'at Eserleri: 12, 1977).
- [Emre], Ahmet Cevat, 'Darülfünunumuzun [1]slâhi için bir Anket yapmağa ve bir rapor vermeye memur edilen Profesör Malche ile Mülâkat' in *Muhit*, IV, 44 (June 1932), pp. 38-9.
- [Emre], Ahmet Cevat, *Nedim. Hayatı - Seçme Şiirleri* (İstanbul, 1938).
- Enginün, İnci, *Halide Edib Advar* (Ankara: Toker, 1986).
- Ersanlı Behar, B., *İktidar ve Tarih. Türkiye'de "Resmî Tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu (1929-1937)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Afa Yayınları, 1996).
- Ersoy, A., *Türk Tezhip Sanatı* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 1988).
- Ertem, Sadri, 'Tarihî Roman' in *Yedigün*, 4, 179 (12 August 1936).
- Eyice, Semavi, 'Atatürk'ün büyük bir tarih yazdırma teşebbüsü: Türk Tarihin Ana Hatları' in *Belleten*, XXXII, 128 (October 1968), pp. 509-26.
- Eyice, Semavi, *Ayasofya* (İstanbul: Yapı ve Kredi Bankası, 1984).
- Eyice, Semavi, 'Mamboury, Ernest' in *DBİA*, vol. V (1994), pp. 283-5.
- Gazel, Ahmet Ali, 'İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Bir Sivil İtaatsizlik Örneği: Lütfi Fikri Bey'in Tanzimat Gazetesi, in *AAD*, 24 (2005), pp.127-38.

- [Gerçek], Selim Nüzhet, *Türk Matbaacılığı. İkiyüzüncü Sene-i Devriyyesi Münâsebetiyle* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ebüzziya, 1928).
- [Gerçek], Selim Nüzhet, *Türk Gazeteciliği* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- Gerçek, Selim Nüzhet, *Türk Matbaacılığı I Müteferrika Matbaası* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1939).
- Gerçek, Selim Nüzhet, *İstanbul'dan Ben de Geçtim*, ed. A. Birinci and Kara, İ. (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1997).
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib, 'II. Racoczi Ferencz ve tevabiine dair yeni vesikalar' in *Belleten*, V/20 (1941), pp. 577-95.
- Göker, Muzafer, 'Le deuxième congres d'histoire turque' in *Belleten*, II, 5-6 (January-April 1938).
- Gökman, Muzaffer, *Tarihi Sevdiren Adam. Ahmet Refik Altınay - Hayatı ve Eserleri* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1978).
- Gökay, O. Ş., *Kâtip Çelebi. Yaşamı, Kişiliği ve Yapıtlarından Seçmeler* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası, 1982).
- Göncüoğlu, S. F., 'Humbarahane Kışlası ve Camii' in *TDVİA* (1998), vol. XVIII, pp. 353-4.
- [Gövsal], İbrahim Alâettin, *Nedim* (İstanbul, 1932).
- Gövsal, İbrahim Alâettin, 'Ahmet Refik . . .' in *Yedigün*, 5, 241 (20 October 1937), p. 9.
- [Günaltay], Şemseddin, *Zulmetden Nûra* (İstanbul: Tevsi Tıbaat Matbaası, 1341/1925).
- Günaltay, Şemseddin, 'Türk Tarih Tezi Hakkındaki Intikatlara Mahiyeti ve Tezini Kat'î Zaferi' in *Belleten*, 7-8 (1938), pp. 338-65.
- Güzel, Şirin, 'Feminizm Üzerine Görüşler' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (1985), vol. 4.
- Güzel, Şirin, 'Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Toplumsal Değişim ve Kadın' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (1985) vol. 4.
- Hanotaux, Gabriel, *Tarih ve Müverrihler*, ed. Ahmed Refik (İstanbul, 1932).
- Halaçoğlu, A., 'Humbaracı' in *TDVİA* (1998), vol. XVIII, pp. 349-50.
- İşık, İhsan, *Yazarlar Sözlüğü* (İstanbul: Risale Yayınları, s. d.).
- İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin, 'Osmanlı Medrese Tarihçiliğinin İlk Safhası (1916-1965) – Keşif ve Tasarlama Dönemi' in *Belleten*, CLXIV (August 2000), pp. 541-82.
- İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin, 'Fâtih Külliyesi Medreseleri Ne Değildi! Tarih Yazıcılığı Bakımından Tenkit ve Değerlendirme Denemesi' in *Büyük Cihad'dan Frenk Fodulluğuna* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1996), pp. 39-84.
- İlgürel, M., 'Yeniçeriler' in *İA*, vol. XIII (1986), pp. 385-95.

- İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi, İstanbul 20 - 25 Eylül 1937* (Ankara: TTK, 1943).
- İnalçık, Halil 'Türk İlimi ve M. Fuad Köprülü' in *Türk Kültürü*, VI, 65 (March 1968), pp. 289-94.
- İnan, Âfet, 'Atatürk ve Tarih Tezi', in *Belleten*, III, 10 (1 April 1939), pp. 243-6.
- İnan, Âfet, *Atatürk ve İlim* (Ankara: TTK, 1963).
- İpşir[oglu], Mazhar Şevket, *Avrupa Kültür Tarihinde Rönesans* (C.H.P. Konferansları: 16, 1940).
- İpşir[oglu], Mazhar Şevket, *Rönesans Sanatı* (İstanbul: İÜ Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1942).
- İslâm Ansiklopedisi. İslâm Âlemi Tarih, Coğrafya, Etnografya ve Bibliografya Lügati*, I, 1. - 9. cüz, âb - 'atama, (İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1942).
- İstanbul, 'İkdam' in *DBİA*, vol. IV (1994), p. 145.
- İstanbul, 'Ruşen Eşref Üneydin' in *DBİA*, vol. VII (1994), p. 342.
- İstanbul Üniversitesi Nizam defteri, 1933-1970* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, s. a.).
- Kabapınar, Y., 'Lise Tarih Kitapları' in *TvT*, XVIII, 106 (October 1992), pp. 36-40, 107 (November 1992), pp. 28-31, 108 (December 1992), pp. 39-44.
- Kahraman, Âlim, *Yahya Kemal Beyatlı* (İstanbul: Şüle Yayınları, 1998).
- Kaplan, Mehmet, 'Bülbül' in *İA* (İstanbul: Maarif Vekâleti, 1944), vol. 2, pp. 832-3.
- Kaplan, Mehmet, *Tevfik Fikret ve Şiiri* (İstanbul: Türkiye yayinevi, 1946).
- Kandemir, Feridun, 'Ahmed Refik Muharririmize Neler Anlatıyor' in *Perşembe Dergisi*, 60 (21 May 1936). Quoted in Muzaffer Gökman, *Tarihi Sevdiren Adam*, pp. 33-40.
- Karal, Enver Ziya, 'Tanzimattan evvel Garplılışma Hareketleri' in *Tanzimat* (1940), pp. 13-30.
- Karal, Enver Ziya, 'Ahmet III.' in *İA* (1942), vol. I, pp. 165-8.
- Karal, Enver Ziya, *Selim III.ün Hatt-ı Hümayunları. Harpler ve İsyanlar* (Ankara: TTK, 1942).
- Karal, Enver Ziya, *Selim III.ün Hatt-ı Hümayunları. Nizam-ı Cedid* (Ankara: TTK, 1946).
- Karal, Enver Ziya *Osmanlı Tarihi, Cilt V: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)* (Ankara: TTK, 1947).
- Kefeli, Emel, 'Yahya Kemal ve Fêtes Galantes' in *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat İncelemeleri* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2000).
- Kızıltan, M., *Fatma Aliye Hanım. Yaşamı - Sanatı - Yapıtları ve Nisvan-ı İslam* (İstanbul: Mutlu Yayıncılık, 1993).

- Kızıltan, M., 'Türk Kadın Hakları Mücadele Tarihinde Fatma Aliye Hanım'ın Yeri' in *K-K* (January 1993), pp. 83-93.
- Kili, Suna, *Kemalism* (İstanbul: School of Business Administration and Economics, Robert College, 1969).
- Kocakaplan, İsa, *Yahya Kemal'in Şiirlerinde Edebî Sanatlar* (İstanbul, unpublished Master's Thesis İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1990).
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem, 'Altınay (Ahmed Refik)' in *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. II (1959), pp. 732-43.
- Koraltürk, M., 'Hasan Ali Yücel (1897-1961)' in *TvT*, XXVIII 166 (October 1997).
- Korgunal, Muharrem Zeki, *Namaz Hocası ve Namaz Süreleri* (İstanbul: Mehmet Baki, 1944).
- Korkmaz, Zeynep, *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türk Dili* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 1974).
- Kozanoğlu, Abdullah Ziya, *Lâle Devrinde Patronalılar Saltanatı*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1943)
- Kuran, E., *Avrupa'da Osmanlı İkamet Elçiliklerinin Kuruluşu ve İlk Elçilerin Siyasî Faaliyetleri* (Ankara: Ayyıldız Matbaası, 1988).
- Kurat, Akdes Nimet, *XII Karl'ın Türkiyede kalışı ve bu sıralarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (İstanbul: Koskun Matbaası, 1943).
- Kurat, Akdes Nimet, 'XVIII. Yüzyıl Başı Avrupa "Umumî Harbi"nde Türkiye'nin Tarafsızlığı' in *Bellekten*, VII, 17 (1943), pp. 245-72.
- Kurun*, 89 (1937).
- Malche, Albert, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hakkında Rapor* (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1939).
- Mahir, Banu, 'Saray Nakkaşhanesinin ünlü Ressamı Şah Kulu ve Eserleri' in *TSY*, 1 (1986), pp. 113-30.
- [Mamboury] Mânbüri, Ernest, *İstanbul Rehber-i Seyyahin* (İstanbul: Rizzo ve Mahdumu, 1925).
- Mardin, Şerif, *Jön Türklerinin Siyasî Fikirleri*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: İletişim, 1989).
- Mazioğlu, Hasibe, *Nedim'in Divan Şiirlerinde Getirdiği Yenilik* (Ankara: TTK, 1957).
- Nabi, Y., *Tevfik Fikret. Hayatı - Sanatı - Şiirleri*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Varlık, 1967).
- Okyar, Osman and İnalçık, Halil (eds), *Türkiye'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi (1071-1920)* (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 1980).
- [Ongunsu], Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin [Tekel], *Kurûn-ı Cedidde ve Asr-ı Hâzırda Türkiye Tarihi. İstanbulun Fethinden Zamanımıza Kadar*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Maarif Vekâleti, 1926).
- Ortaylı, İlber, *İkinci Abdülhamit Döneminde Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Alman Nüfuzu* (Ankara: S.B.F. Yayınları, 1981),

- Ortaylı, İlber, 'Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph Freiherr von' in *TDVİA*, vol. XIV, pp. 491-4.
- [Ozansoy], Halit Fahri, *Nedim. Üç Perdelik Manzum Piyes* (İstanbul, 1932).
- Özbaran, Salih, *Tarih ve Öğretim* (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1992).
- Özbaran, Salih (ed.), *Tarih Öğretimi ve Ders Kitapları. 1994 BUCA Sempozyumu 29 Eylül-1 Ekim 1994* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1995)
- Özcan, A., 'Humbaracı Ahmed Paşa' in *TDVİA* (1998), vol. XVIII, pp. 351-3.
- Özer, İ., *Tekel*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1967).
- Özil, Ş. and N. Tapan (eds), *Türkiye'nin Ders Kitapları. Orta Öğretim Ders Kitaplarına Eleştirel bir Yaklaşım* (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1991).
- Parmaksızoğlu, İ., 'İzzi. İzzi, Sulayman Efendi in *İA*, vol. V/2, pp. 1267-9.
- Pekin, N. Suner (ed.), 'Yahya Kemal'le Konuşmalar ve Hâtıralar' in *Yahya Kemal Ensitüsü Mecmuası*, III (1988), pp. 263-87.
- Rıza Nür, Dr., *Türk Tarihi*, 12 vols (İstanbul: Telif ü Tercüme Encümeni, 1343/1925).
- Sahillioğlu, H., 'Ömer Lütfi Barkan' in *İÜİFM*, 41, 1/4 (September 1982).
- Sakaoğlu, Necdet, 'Altınay, Ahmed Refik' in *DBİA*, vol. I (1993), pp. 218-20.
- Sakaoğlu, Necdet, 'Darü'l-Hilafetü'l-Aliyye Medresesi' in *DBİA*, vol. II (1994), pp. 564-65.
- Sarıhan, Zeki, 'Cumhuriyet Devrimi'nin Osmanlı'ya bakışı' in *BÜ*, 59 (May 1999).
- Schleifert, J., 'Cevdet Paşa' in *İA*, vol. III (1945), pp. 114-23.
- Sertel, Sabiha, *İlericilik, Gericilik Kavgasında Tevfik Fikret*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları, 1996).
- [Sevengil], Refik Ahmed, *İstanbul Nasıl Eğleniyordu? Fetihden Zamanımıza Kadar* (İstanbul: Sühulet Kitabhanesi, 1927).
- Şamsutdinov, A. M., *Mondros'tan Lozan'a Türkiye Ulusal Kurtuluş Savaşı Tarihi 1918-1923*, translator A. Behramoğlu (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 1999).
- Şengör, A. M. Celal, *Hasan-Âli Yücel ve Türk Aydınlanmasının Metabilimsel Temeller* (Ankara: Yükseköğretim Kurulu Matbaası, 1998).
- T. H., 'Subhî, Subhî Mehmed Efendi' in *İA*, vol. X (1967), pp. 169-71.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi, *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1942).
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi, 'Hasan Âli Yücel'e Dair Hatıralar ve Düşünceler' in *Yeni Ufuklar*, 109, (1961), pp. 1-10.

- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi, *Beş Şehir*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Dergâh, 1979).
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi, *Yahya Kemal*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1985).
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi, *19uncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1988).
- Tansel, F. Abdullah, 'NEDİM' in *İA*, vol. IX (1960), p. 169.
- Tanyol, Cahit, 'Yahya Kemal'in Dili ve Zevki' in *Türk Edebiyatında Yahya Kemal. İnceleme ve Anılar* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1985), pp. 48-53.
- Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 6 vols (İstanbul: İletişim, 1985).
- Tanzimat. Yüzcüncü yıldönümü münasebetile, I* (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1940).
- Tarih I. Tarihten ev[v]elki zamanlar ve eski zamanlar* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- Tarih II. Ortazamanlar* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- Tarih III. Yeni ve yakın zamanlarda Osmanlı Türk Tarihi* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- Tarih IV. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- 'Tarih Encümeni Yeni Bir Tarzda Teşkil Ediliyor' in *Cumhuriyet* (8 July 1927/8 Muharrem 1345) no. 1135, p. 3.
- 'Tarih Encümeni Dün İlk İçtimâini Akd Etdi' in *Cumhuriyet*, no. 1212 (23 September 1927/26 Rebiyülevvel 1346), p. 1.
- 'Tarih Encümeni Reisi Ahmed Refik Bey İstifâ Etdi' in *Cumhuriyet*, no. 1219 (30 September 1927/3 Rebiyülâhîr 1219), p. 1.
- Tunaya, Tarık Zafer, *Türkiyenin Siyasi Hayatında Batılulaşma Hareketleri* (İstanbul: Yedigün Matbaası, 1960).
- Tunçay, Mete, *Türk Cumhuriyetinin Tek Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması (1923-1931)* (Ankara: Cem, 1981).
- Türk Medeni Kanunu*, ed. E. Şener, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Ankara: Seçkin, 1998).
- Türk Tarihinin Anahatları* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1930).
- Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları - Methal Kısmı* (İstanbul, Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- Türk Tarih Kurumu Ana Tüzüğü* (Ankara: TTK, 1963).
- Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmî Kaynakları, vol.3, Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Ok'u*, ed. Taha Parla, (İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 1992).
- Uçman, Abdullah, 'Encümen-i Dâniş' in *TDVİA*, vol.XI (1995), pp.176-8.
- Unat, Faik Reşit, 'Ahmet III. Devrine Ait bir İslahat Takriri', in *TV*, I, 2 (August 1941), pp. 107-21.

- Unat, Faik Reşit, *Hicri Tarihleri Milâdî Tarihe Çevirme Kılavuzu*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (Ankara: TTK, 1994).
- Unat, Faik Reşit, *Osmanlı Sefirleri ve Sefâretnâmeleri*, ed. Bekir Sıtkı Baykal (Ankara: TTK, 1968).
- Uraz, Mehmet, *Nedim. Yetiştigi Asır, Hayatı, Şahsiyeti ve Şiirlerinden Parçalar* (İstanbul: Tefeyyüz Kitabevi, 1938).
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, 'Sadrâzam Halil Hamid Paşa' in *TM*, V, (1935), pp. 213-67.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, 'Vezir Hakkı Mehmed Paşa, 1747-1811' in *TM*, 6 (1936-39), pp. 177-284.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, 'Tarihte vesikacılığın ehemmiyetine dair küçük bir misal' in *Belleten*, II, 7-8, (July-September 1938), pp. 373-8.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, 'Yeni Türk Tarihinde vesikacılık' in *Belleten*, II, 7-8 (July-September 1938), pp. 367-71.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, 'Cezayirli Gazi Hasan Paşa'ya dair' in *TM*, 7-8, (1940-42), pp. 17-40.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları I. Acemi Ocağı ve Yeniçeri Ocağı* (Ankara: TTK, 1943).
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları II. Cebeci, Topçu, Top Arabacılar, Lağımçı Ocakları ve Kapukulu Suvarileri* (Ankara: TTK, 1944).
- III. *Türk Tarih Kongresi Ankara, 15 - 20 Kasım 1943* (Ankara: TTK, 1948).
- Ülgen, E., 'Mehmed Fuad Köprülü' in *Tarih ve Medeniyet*, V, 52 (July 1998), pp. 60-4.
- [Ünaydın], Ruşen Eşref, 'Lâle Devrinde Saadabad Akşamları' in *Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın'dan Seçmeler*, ed. Necat Birinci (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1982), pp. 38-44.
- Varlık, Bülent, 'Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet Dergileri' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (1985) vol. 1.
- Yalansız, Nedim, 'Cumhuriyet Dönemi Osmanlı Tarihi Çalışmaları (1923-1960)', in *TT*, 14, 82 (October 2000).
- [Yazıkız], Necib Asım, *Türk Tarihi* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1927).
- [Yazıkız], Necip Asım, 'Türk Matbaacılığı' in *TTEM*, new series I, 2, (September-October 1929) (İstanbul, 1930), pp. 46-8.
- [Yöntem], Ali Canib 'Rönesans ve Türkiye' in *Hayat*, I, 1-2 (December 1926), pp. 5-7.
- [Yöntem], Ali Canib, 'Tecdüdüperver Vezirlerden: İbrahim Paşa' in *Hayat*, I, 5 (30 December 1926), pp. 9-13/89-93.
- Yüce, N., 'Ahmed Cevdet, İkdamcı' in *DBİA*, vol. II (1989), pp. 55-6.



- Yücel, Hasan Âli, 'Kitabımız' in *Pazartesi Konuşmaları* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1937).
- Yücel, Hasan Âli, 'Tarihimizde bir fecri-kâzip ve Nedim' in *Pazartesi Konuşmaları* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1937).
- Yücel, Hasan Âli, 'Tarihte Metot' in *Bilimler Felsefesi Mantık* (Ankara: MEB, 1947), p. 269-93.

### Sources in Other Languages

- Abu Manneh, Butrus, 'Sultan Abdulhamid II and Shaikh Abulhuda al-Sayyadi' in *MES*, 15 (1979), pp. 131-53.
- Abou-El-Haj, R. A., *Formation of the Modern State. The Ottoman Empire Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).
- Adahl, Karin (ed.), *The Sultan's Procession. The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657 - 1658 and the Ralamb Paintings* (İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute, 2006).
- [Adivar], Halide Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal* (New York and London: J. Murray, 1928).
- [Adivar], Halide Edib, *Turkey faces West. A Turkish View of Recent Changes and their Origin* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1930).
- Akarlı, Engin, 'Abdülhamid II's Attempts to Integrate Arabs into the Ottoman System' in David Kushner (ed.), *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period: Political, Social, and Economic Transformation* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1986), pp. 74-89.
- Akbayrak, Hasan, *From Court History Recorder to an Official Historical Writing Society in Turkey: The Case of the Ottoman Historical Society* (unpublished M.A. dissertation, Boğaziçi University, 1987).
- Alp, Tekin [Moiz Cohen], *Le Kemalisme* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1937).
- Alparslan, Ali, 'Some Ottoman Sultans as Calligraphers' in *The 8th International Congress of Turkish Art, Cairo 26 September-1 October 1987* (Cairo: Matba'at al-Hay'at al-Athar al-Misriyah, 1987).
- Arai, Masami, *Turkish Nationalism in the Young Turk Era* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- Babinger, Franz, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1927).
- Barchard, David, *Turkey and the West* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985).
- Bayerle, Gustav, 'The Compromise at Zsitvatorok' in *AO*, VI, (1980), pp. 22-28.

- Belge, Burhan, 'La Mission du Kamalisme' in *La Turquie Kemaliste*, 20 (1937), p.1.
- Berkes, Niyazi, 'Historical Background of Turkish Secularism' in R. N. Frye (ed.), *Islam and the West* (The Hague: Mouton, 1957).
- Berkes, Niyazi, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964).
- Berkes, Niyazi, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, new ed. (London: C. Hurst, 1998).
- Berktaş, Halil and Suraiya Faroqhi, (eds), *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History* (London: Cass, 1992).
- Berridge, G. R., 'Diplomatic integration with Europe before Selim III' in A. Nuri Yurdusev (ed.), *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 114-30.
- Black, Jeremy, *The Rise of the European Powers 1679-1793* (London: Edward Arnold, 1990).
- Boppe, Auguste, *Les peintres du Bosphore au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1911).
- Bosworth, C. E., 'Nasihāt al-Muluk' in *EI*, new ed. (1993), vol. VII, pp. 984-8.
- Bowen, Harold, 'Ahmad III' in *EI*, new ed. (1960), vol. I/A-B, p. 269.
- Bozarslan, Hamit, 'Kurdish Nationalism in Turkey: From Tacit Contract to Rebellion (1919-1925)' in Abbas Vali, *Essays on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism* (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers, 2003), pp.163-90.
- Bruinessen, Maarten van, *Agha, Shaikh and State: On the Social and Political Organization of Kurdistan* (London: Zed Books, 1992).
- Buck, August (ed.), *Renaissance und Renaissancismus von Jacob Burckhardt bis Thomas Mann* (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1990).
- Burke, Peter, *The French Historical Revolution. The Annales School 1929-89* (Cambridge: Polity, 1990).
- Burke, Peter, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997).
- Butterfield, Herbert, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London: G. Bell, 1931).
- Cassels, Lavender, *The Struggle for the Ottoman Empire, 1717-1740* (London: Murray, 1966).
- Chambers, Richard L., 'The Education of a Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Alim, Ahmed Cevdet Paşa' in *IJMES*, 4, 4 (October 1973), pp. 440-64.
- Chapman, Tim, *The Congress of Vienna. Origins, processes and results* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

- Charles, F., A. Leroy-Beaulieu, e.a., *Les Questions actuelles de politique étrangère en Europe* (Paris, 1911).
- Chickering, Roger, *Imperial Germany and the Great War, 1914 - 1918* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998).
- Childs, John, *Armies and Warfare in Europe 1648-1789* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1982).
- Cochin, D., *Quatre français: Pasteur, Chevreul, Brunetière, Vandal* (Paris: Hachette, 1912).
- Conway, M., *Catholic Politics in Europe 1918-1945* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
- Cowart, Georgia, 'Watteau's Pilgrimage to Cythera and the Subversive Utopia of the opera-ballet' in *Art Bulletin* (September 2001).
- G. A. Craig, 'The World War I Alliance of the Central Powers in Retrospect: The Military Cohesion of the Alliance' in *JMH*, 37, (1965), pp. 336-44.
- Çolak, Yılmaz, 'Ottomanism vs. Kemalism: Collective Memory and Cultural Pluralism in 1990s Turkey' in *MES*, 42, 4 (July 2006), pp. 587-602.
- Denny, Walter, 'Dating Ottoman Turkish Works in the Saz Style' in *Muqarnas*, 1 (1983), pp. 103-21.
- Deringil, Selim, *The Well-Protected Domains. Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998).
- Diehl, Charles, *Figures Byzantines*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed. (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1927).
- Eisenstein, E., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change. Communication and Cultural Transformations in early-modern Europe*, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1979).
- Elliott, J. H. and H. G. Koenigsberger (eds), *The Diversity of History: Essays in Honour of Sir Herbert Butterfield* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970).
- Evans, R. J. W., *Rudolf II and his World. A Study in Intellectual History 1576-1612* (Oxford: OUP, 1973).
- Evans, R. J. W., 'Rudolf II and his Historians' in *Prag um 1600. Beiträge zur Kunst und Kultur am Hofe Rudolfs II.* (Wien: Luca, 1988).
- Evin, Ahmet Ömer, 'A Poem by Nedim' in *Edebiyat*, II, 1 (1977).
- Evin, Ahmet Ömer, 'The Tulip Age and Definitions of "Westernization"' in Osman Okyar and İnalçık, Halil (eds), *Türkiye'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi (1071-1920)* (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 1980), pp. 131-45.
- Farhi, David, 'The Şeriat as a Political Slogan - or the "Incident of the 31st March"' in *MES*, VII, 3 (October 1971), pp. 275-99.

- Fink, Carole, *Marc Bloch: a life in history* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989).
- Geanakoplos, Deno John, *Byzantine East and Latin West: The Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966).
- Georgeon, François, 'Les foyers turcs à l'époque kémaliste (1923-1931)' in *Turcica*, XIV (1982), pp. 168-215.
- Gildea, R., *The Past in French History* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1994).
- Ginio, Eyal, 'Mobilizing the Ottoman Nation during the Balkan Wars (1912-1913): Awakening from the Ottoman Dream' in *War in History*, 12, 2 (April 2005), pp. 156-177.
- Goodwin, Godfrey, *A History of Ottoman Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971).
- Göcek, Fatma Müge, *East encounters West. France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Helmreich, Paul C., *From Paris to Sèvres. The Partition of the Ottoman Empire* (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1974).
- Hrozny, F. 'Die Lösung des Hethitischen Problems' in *MDOG*, 56, (1915), pp. 17-50.
- Hunt, Lynn, *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution* (London: Methuen, 1986).
- Hunt, Lynn and J. R. Censer, *Liberty, Equality, fraternity: Exploring the French Revolution* (University Parks, PA.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).
- Iggers, G. G., *Historiography in the Twentieth Century. From Scientific Objectivity to Postmodern Challenge* (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1997).
- İnalcık, Halil, 'Impact of the Annales School on Ottoman Studies and New Findings' in *JFBC* (1978), pp. 69-96.
- İnalcık, Halil and Cemal Kafadar (eds), *Süleyman the Second and his Time* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993).
- Jäschke, Gotthard, 'Die Türkei seit dem Weltkriege. Geschichtskalender 1918 - 1929' in *DWDL*, 10 (1927-29), pp. 1-154.
- Jung, Dietrich and W. Piccoli, *Turkey at the Crossroads. Ottoman Legacies and a Greater Middle East* (London and New York: Zed Books, 2001).
- Kayali, Hasan, *Arabs and Young Turks. Ottomanism, Arabism and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918* (Berkeley and London.: University of California Press, 1997).
- Kafadar, Cemal, 'The Myth of the Golden Age: Ottoman Historical Consciousness in the Post-Süleymanic Era' in Halil İnalcık and

- Kafadar, Cemal (eds), *Süleyman the Second and his Time* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993), pp. 37-48.
- Karpat, Kemal H., *Turkey's Politics, The transition to a multi-party system* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1959).
- Keddie, Nikki R., *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din "al-Afghani". A Political Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972).
- Kleinert, Claudia, *Die Revision der Historiographie des Osmanischen Reiches am Beispiel von Abdülhamid II. (1930-1990)* (Berlin: Schwarz, 1995).
- Knudtzon, Jørgen A., *Die zwei Arzawa Briefe: die ältesten Urkunden in Indo-Germanischer Sprache* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902).
- Kunt, Metin, 'Türkische Beiträge zur Untersuchung der Beziehungen zwischen dem Osmanischen und Habsburger-Reich' in Zygmunt Abrahamowicz ea, *Die Türkenkriege in der historischen Forschung* (Wien: F. Deuticke, 1983).
- Kuran, Ercüment, 'Ottoman Historiography of the Tanzimat Period', in Bernard Lewis and Holt, P. M. (eds), *Historians of the Middle East* (London: OUP, 1962).
- Kushner, David, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism 1876-1908* (London: Cass, 1977).
- Küçük, Hülya, *The role of the Bektashi in Turkey's national struggle* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002).
- Landau, Jacob, *The Hijaz Railway* (Detroit, Mi.: Wayne State University Press, 1971).
- Lewis, Bernard, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).
- Lewis, Bernard and P. M. Holt (eds), *Historians of the Middle East* (London: OUP, 1962).
- Lewis, Bernard, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (London: Phoenix, 1982).
- Lewis, Geoffrey L., *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success* (Oxford: OUP, 1999).
- Liman von Sanders, [Otto], *Five Years in Turkey*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Anapolis, 1928).
- Macqueen, J. G., *The Hittites*, paperback edition (London: Thames & Hudson, 1996).
- Mamboury, Ernest, 'La Turquie Kamaliste Touristique' in *LTK*, no. 8 (August 1935), pp. 2-8.
- Mamboury, Ernest, 'L'art turc du XVIIIème siècle' in *LTK*, no.19 (June 1937), pp. 2-11.
- Mardin, Ebül'ulâ, *Medenî Hukuk Cephesinden Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, (1822-1895) Ölümün 50inci yıldönümü vesilesile* (Istanbul: Cumhuriyet matbaası, 1946).

- Mardin, Şerif, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought. A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*, new ed. (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000).
- McNeill, William H., *Europe's Steppe Frontier 1500-1800* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1964).
- Melikoff, Irène, 'Lâle Devri' in *EL*, new ed. (1986), vol.V, p. 641.
- Munslow, Alun, *Deconstructing history* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
- Murphey, Rhoads, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press, 1999).
- Neumann, Christoph K., *Araç Tarih, Amaç Tanzimat. Tarih-i Cevdet'in Siyasi Anlamı* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1999).
- Nora, Pierre, 'Lavisse, The Nation's Teacher' in *Realms of Memory. The Construction of the French Past*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Columbia UP, 1997), pp. 151-84.
- Ochsenwald, William, *Religion, Society and the State in Arabia. The Hijaz under Ottoman Control, 1840-1908* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State UP, 1984).
- Olson, Robert W. and William F. Tucker, 'The Sheikh Sait Rebellion in Turkey (1925)' in *DWDI*, 18, 3/4 (1978), pp. 95-211.
- Olson, Robert W., 'The Remains of Talat: A Dialectic between Republic and Empire' in *DWDI*, 26, 1/4 (1986), pp. 46-56.
- Paillarès, Michel, *Le Kémalisme devant les alliés* (Constantinople and Paris: Éditions du Bosphore, 1922)
- Pamuk, Şevket, *The Ottoman Empire and European Capitalism, 1820-1913* (Cambridge: CUP, 1987).
- Parla, Taha, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp 1876-1924* (Leiden: Brill, 1985).
- Pirenne, Henri, *Mahomet et Charlemagne*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Paris and Brussels: Félix Alcan, 1937).
- Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists Oxford 1928* (London: OUP, 1929)
- Quataert, Donald (ed.), *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000).
- Quataert, Donald, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).
- Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*, 12<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul, 1991).
- Rey, L., *Le Petit Trianon et le hameau de Marie-Antoinette* (Paris: P. Vorms., 1936).
- Robson, E., 'The Armed Forces and the Art of War' in J. O. Lindsay, *The New Cambridge Modern History, Volume VII: The Old Regime 1713-63* (Cambridge: CUP, 1957), pp. 163-89.

- Rocheblave, Samuel-Élie, *L'art et le goût en France de 1600 à 1900* (Paris: Colin, 1923).
- Roider, K. A., *The Reluctant Ally: Austria's Policy in the Austro-Turkish War, 1737-1719* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972).
- Salzman, Ariel, 'The Age of Tulips: Confluence and Conflict in Early Modern Consumer Culture (1550-1730)' in Donald Quataert (ed.), *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 83-106.
- Schama, Simon, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Collins, 1987).
- Shaw, S. J., 'The Origins of Ottoman Military Reform: The Nizam-ı Cedid Army of Sultan Selim III' in *JMH*, XXXVII, 3 (September 1965), pp.291-306
- Shaw, Stanford J., *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III, 1789-1807* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1971).
- Shaw, Stanford J. and E. K. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey*, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1977).
- Shissler, A. Holly, *Between Two Empires. Ahmet Ağaoğlu and the New Turkey* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2003).
- Silay, Kemal, *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court. Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1994).
- Solbrig, Ingeborg Hildegard, *Hammer-Purgstall und Goethe. "Dem Zaubermeister das Werkzeug"* (Bern and Frankfurt: H. Lang, 1973).
- Somel, S. Akşin, *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire* (Lanham, MD and Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2003).
- Song, M., *Art Theories of Charles Blanc 1813 - 1882* (Ann Arbor, Mich: UMI Research Press, 1984).
- Stern, J. P., *A Study of Nietzsche* (Cambridge: CUP, 1979).
- Strohmeier, Martin, *Seldschukische Geschichte und türkische Geschichtswissenschaft. Die Seldschuken im Urteil moderner türkischer Historiker* (Berlin: K. Schwarz, 1984).
- Taylor-Horrex, Susan, *Verlaine: Fêtes galantes and Romances sans paroles* (London: Grant & Cutler, 1988).
- Thibaudet, Albert, *La poésie de Stéphane Mallarmé. Étude littéraire* (Paris: M. Rivière, 1926).
- Toprak, B., 'Die Institutionalisierung des Laizismus in der türkischen Republik' in J. Blaschke and M. Van Bruinissen (eds), *Thema: Islam*

- und Politik in der Türkei, Jahrbuch zur Geschichte und Gesellschaft des Vorderen und Mittleren Orients 1984* (Berlin, 1984).
- Toynbee, A. J. and K. P. Kirkwood, *Turkey* (New York: Scribner, 1927).
- Trumpener, Ulrich, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire, 1914-1918* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968).
- Vaughan, C. E., 'Carlyle and His German Masters' in *Essays and Studies*, I (Oxford: OUP, 1910), pp. 168-96.
- Weber, F. G., *Eagles on the Crescent: Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Turkish Alliance, 1914-1918* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970).
- Wensinck, Arent Jan, 'Khamr' in *EI*, new ed. (1978), vol. IV, pp. 994-7.
- White, V. Hayden, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore, 1973).
- White, V. Hayden, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).
- Wittek, Paul, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1938).
- Zeine, Z. N., *Arab-Turkish Relations and the Emergence of Arab Nationalism* (Beirut: Khayat, 1958).
- Zilfi, Madeline C. 'The Kadızadeli: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul' in *JNES*, 45, 4 (October 1986), pp. 251-69.
- Zilfi, Madeline C., *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Zürcher, E. J., *The Unionist Factor: The Rôle of the Committee of Union and Progress in the Turkish National movement 1905-1926* (Leiden: Brill, 1984).
- Zürcher, E. J., 'Young Turk Memoirs as a Historical source', in *MES*, 22, 4 (1986), pp. 562-70.
- Zürcher, E. J., 'The Ottoman Legacy of the Turkish Republic: An Attempt at a New Periodization' in *DWDL*, new series, 32, 2 (1992), pp. 237-53.
- Zürcher, E. J., *Turkey. A Modern History* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1993).
- Zürcher, E. J., 'The Rise and Fall of "modern" Turkey' (1998). TULP Working paper Cfr. <http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/Lewis.htm>.
- Zürcher, E. J., 'Fundamentalism' as an Exclusionary Device in Kemalist Turkish Nationalism', in Willem van Schendel and Zürcher, E. J. (eds), *Identity Politics in Central Asia and the Muslim World: Nationalism, Ethnicity and Labour in the Twentieth Century* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), pp. 207-20.



Zürcher, E. J., 'Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları' in Tanıl Bora (ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001), vol. 2.

Zürcher, E. J., 'From Empire to Republic – Problems of Transition, Continuity and Change'. Cfr. [ww.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/Fromtorep.htm](http://ww.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/Fromtorep.htm)

# Notes

## Introduction: The Idea of a 'Tulip Age' (1718-30)

- \* S. Faroqi, 'Preface' in R. A. Abou-El-Haj, *Formation of the Modern State. The Ottoman Empire Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. IX-X.
- 1 C. Kafadar, 'The Myth of the Golden Age: Ottoman Historical Consciousness in the Post-Süleymanic Era' in H. İnalcık and C. Kafadar (eds), *Süleyman the Second and his Time* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993), pp. 37-48.
  - 2 C. Kafadar, 'The Myth of the Golden Age', p. 40.
  - 3 C. Kafadar, 'The Myth of the Golden Age', p. 40.
  - 4 C. Kafadar, 'The Myth of the Golden Age', p. 40.
  - 5 This event was called *Akbank Aya İrini Bach Günleri*, 21-27 Eylül 1998: *Bach, caz ve LALE DEVRI*. 'Lale Devri Bach'la buluştun', in *Milliyet* (13 September 1998), www.milliyet.com.tr/ekler/gazete\_pazar/980920/muzik/muzik.html
  - 6 25 Eylül Cuma 17.30, '18. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Osmanlı'nın Batı'ya Dönen Yüzü', Yöneten: Cem Mansur, Konuşmacılar: Murat Belge, Baha Tanman, Uğur Tanyeli, Bülent Aksoy.
  - 7 *Turkish Art Through The Ages. A "Live" Documentary with scores of colour slides*, by Yıldız Kenter and Talat Halman, 1 February 2001.
  - 8 H. Bowen, 'Ahmad III' in *EI*, new ed. (1960), vol. I/A-B, p. 269.
  - 9 I. Melikoff, 'Lâle Devri' in *EI*, new ed. (1986), vol.V, p. 641.
  - 10 L. Hunt, *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution* (London: Methuen, 1986); L. Hunt and J. R. Censer, *Liberty, Equality, fraternity: Exploring the French Revolution* (University Parks, PA.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).
  - 11 S. Hilav, 'Düşünce Tarihi (1908-1980)' in S. Akşin (ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 4. Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*, 5th ed. (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1997), p. 360.
  - 12 T. Z. Tunaya, *Türkiyenin Siyasî Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri* (İstanbul: Yedigün Matbaası, 1960), p.20 ('Kısmî Müesseseler Islâhları (1718-1826)').
  - 13 He says literally '[d]evrenin en önemli durakları Lâle Devri (1718-1730) ve Nizamı Cedid (1789-1807) hareketleridir'. T. Z. Tunaya, *Türkiyenin Siyasî*, p. 20.
  - 14 B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 45.
  - 15 Berkes, however, uses the term to denote the whole of the eighteenth century, insinuating that the sultans preceding Selim III had performed the groundwork necessary for the establishment of the 'New Order' in 1792. In this he seems to have relied on Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar's insights (cfr. chapter II/3) N. Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964), pp. 45 and 71-85 ('The New Order and its Fall').
  - 16 A. Ö. Evin, 'The Tulip Age and Definitions of "Westernization"' in O. Okyar & H. İnalcık (eds), *Türkiye'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi (1071-1920)* (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 1980), pp. 131-45.
  - 17 A. Ö. Evin, 'The Tulip Age', p. 140.
  - 18 A. Ö. Evin, 'The Tulip Age', p. 139.
  - 19 A. Ö. Evin, 'The Tulip Age', p. 139.

- 20 Melikoff employs this phrase as a sub-heading in her entry. I. Melikoff, 'Lâle Devri', p. 641.
- 21 A. Ö. Evin, 'The Tulip Age', p. 136.
- 22 A. Ö. Evin, 'The Tulip Age', p. 134.
- 23 F. M. Göcek, *East encounters West. France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 81.
- 24 M. Strohmeyer, *Seldschukische Geschichte und türkische Geschichtswissenschaft. Die Seldschuken im Urteil moderner türkischer Historiker* (Berlin: K. Schwarz, 1984), p. 29.
- 25 S. Faroqhi, 'In Search of Ottoman History' in H. Berktaş and S. Faroqhi (eds), *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History* (London: Cass, 1992), p. 223.
- 26 Ch. K. Neumann, *Araç Tarihi, Amaç Tanzimat. Tarih-i Cevdet'in Siyasi Anlamı* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1999), p. 84.
- 27 A. Salzman, 'The Age of Tulips: Confluence and Conflict in Early Modern Consumer Culture (1550-1730)' in D. Quataert (ed.), *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 83-106.
- 28 The scope of the article is very wide, managing to encompass mentioning 'Süleyman the Magnificent', the '[a]mbassador Ogier de Busbeq', the 'East India Company', as well as 'Sultan Ahmed III' and 'Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa'. A. Salzman, 'The Age of Tulips', pp. 83, 86 and 89.
- 29 S. Akşin Somel, *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire* (Lanham, MD and Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2003), pp. 311-2.
- 30 As such, Somel avoids specifically mentioning this term under the 'Tulip Period' heading, but declares that 'in the 18th century prior to 1789' there were signs of 'incidental Westernization'. S. Akşin Somel, *Historical*, p. 322.
- 31 S. Akşin Somel, *Historical*, p. 311.
- 32 *The Sultan's Procession. The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657 - 1658 and the Ralamb Paintings*, ed. K. Adahl (İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute, 2006).
- 33 Cemal Kafadar, 'The City that Ralamb Visited: The Political and Cultural Climate of Istanbul in the 1650s' in *The Sultan's Procession*, p. 61.
- 34 Alun Munslow observes that, '[b]ecause history is written by historians, it is best understood as a cultural product existing within society, and as a part of the historical process rather than an objective methodology and commentary outside of society'. Taking this stand to its logical conclusion Hayden White declares that '[t]he historically real, the past real, is that to which [one] can be referred only by way of an artefact that is textual in nature', an artifact that 'create[s] the illusion that there is a past out there that is directly reflected in the texts'. A. Munslow, *Deconstructing history* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 9-10; V. Hayden White, 'The Context in the Text: Methods and Ideology in Intellectual History' in *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), p. 209.

## Chapter I/1

## The Preamble to the 'Tulip Age': The Perception of Ahmed III and Damad İbrahim, 1910-12

- A. Ö. Evin, 'A Poem by Nedim' in *Edebiyat*, II, 1 (1977), pp. 48-9.
- 1 Reşat Beyatlı, *Yahya Kemal'in Hayatı* (İstanbul?, 1959).
  - 2 So far there has been no serious study of the historian Ahmed Refik Altınay. Muzaffer Gökman's exhaustive bibliography of Ahmed Refik's work includes reprints of various appraisals of the historian. Ahmed Refik's pupil Reşad Ekrem Koçu devoted a long article to his erstwhile professor in his incomplete *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, including a small bibliography. More recently, in the *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* published by the Tarih Vakfı, a short entry was included on the author. Ahmed Refik spent most of his life on Büyük Ada. It seems that his grave in the Muslim cemetery on the island has been lost due to a lack of care for the historian's memory. Muzaffer Gökman, *Tarihi Sevdiren Adam. Ahmet Refik Altınay - Hayatı ve Eserleri* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1978) (hereafter abridged to *Tarihi Sevdiren*); Reşad Ekrem Koçu, 'Altınay (Ahmed Refik)' in *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. II (1959), pp. 732-43; N. Sakaoglu, 'Altınay, Ahmed Refik' in *DBİA*, vol. I (1993), pp. 218-20.
  - 3 N. Suner Pekin (ed.), 'Yahya Kemal'le Konuşmalar ve Hâtıralar' in *Yahya Kemal Ensitüsü Mecmuası*, III (1988), pp. 263-87 (Hereafter abridged to 'Konuşmalar').
  - 4 'Konuşmalar', p. 265.
  - 5 Kahraman does not back up this statement. Âlim Kahraman, *Yahya Kemal Beyatlı* (İstanbul: Şûle Yayınları, 1998), p. 67.
  - 6 This piece was reprinted together with articles on the historians Jules Michelet and Albert Vandal. Ahmed Refik, *Fransız Müverrihleri. Michelet. Lavisse. Vandal* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1932), pp. 25-38.
  - 7 Ahmed Refik, *Fransız*, p. 30.
  - 8 Ahmed Refik reproduced a note written by Lavisse on paper with a 'Université de Paris' header (p. 31), however, even though he gives the date as 10 April 1910, the quality of the reproduction is of such a nature as not to be readily legible. Ahmed Refik, *Fransız*, pp. 31-3.
  - 9 Feridun Kandemir, 'Ahmed Refik Muharririmize Neler Anlatıyor' in *Perşembe Der-gisi*, 60 (21 May 1936). Quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 33.
  - 10 'Muharririmize Neler Anlatıyor', p. 34.
  - 11 Hüseyin Hilmi had occupied the post of Grand Vezir on two separate occasions that year: 14 February - 13 April and 5 May - 28 December 1909. In the intervening months the position had been held by Ahmed Tevfik Paşa. Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Viyana Sefir-i Sâbiki Hüseyin Hilmi Paşa' in *TOEM*, IX-XIII (1 April 1335/1919 - 1 June 1337/1921), pp. 63-74; S. J. Shaw and E. K. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977), vol. II, p. 488.
  - 12 The *Encümen* consisted of twelve permanent members, who either occupied posts in government departments, as lecturers at the *Dârülfünûn* or inside the army. For this reason they were not to receive any wages. Other than the composition of a grand 'national' history of the Ottoman nation, the *TOE* was also keen to undertake research in the extensive Ottoman archive holdings [Hazine-i Evrâk] set up in

- 1262/1846 on the instigation of Mustafa Reşid Paşa, and to publish and publicise these documents. As a result the strong emphasis on archivally-based research which can be seen today is prefigured by the first Ottoman Historical Society (point 10 of the 'İfâde-i Merâm'). Suraiya Faroqhi calls the tendency among contemporary Ottoman scholars to rely exclusively on archival materials 'document fetishism', apparently referring to Halil Berktaş's colourful phraseology in this instance. She provides a diachronic reference, saying that the existence of this vast array of primary sources in the Turkish archives "became known during the 1940s and 1950s, and accessible to a broader group of scholars from about 1960 onward". Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni, 'İfâde-i Merâm' in *TOEM*, I, 1 (1-14 April 1326/1910), pp. 1, 6 and 8.
- A. Çetin, 'Osmanlı Devlet Arşivi'nin Kuruluşu ve Tasnif Çalışmaları', in *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, 21 (December 1982), pp.98-102; S. Faroqhi, 'In Search of Ottoman History', p.235; Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni hakkında Talimât Süreti', in *TOEM*, I, 1 (1-14 April 1326/1910), p.5.
- 13 Pierre Nora, 'Lavis, The Nation's Teacher' in *Realms of Memory. The Construction of the French Past*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Columbia UP, 1997), pp. 151-84.
- 14 Ottomanism as a political concept was poised on the 'brilliant idea of an Ottoman nation [as a] pseudo nation-state from among the various subjects of the multi-national empire', as Masami Arai remarks in a rather derisive fashion. More recently Yılmaz Çolak matter-of-factly states that Ottomanism was founded on 'the idea of a common homeland and common traits based on modern patriotic citizenship and universal law'. The contemporary intellectual Ebüzziya Tevfik expressed this ideological stance in a piece originally conceived as an article for the paper *Tasvir-i Efkâr* but eventually published in his own *Mecmûa*. The piece states that the Ottomans, as a general name given to the population of the Empire, were an amalgam of various peoples, making it impossible to proclaim any individual or family of sound and pure Turkish stock. Ebüzziya Tevfik literally declares the Ottoman 'body' to consist of Arab, Persian, Greek, Kurdish and Armenian elements mixed with a Turkish or Tatar base, making it impossible to determine the exact ethnic make-up of any Ottoman citizen. Masami Arai, *Turkish Nationalism in the Young Turk Era* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), p. 4; Yılmaz Çolak, 'Ottomanism vs. Kemalism: Collective Memory and Cultural Pluralism in 1990s Turkey' in *MES*, 42, 4 (July 2006), p. 589; Ebüzziya Tevfik, 'Türklük ve Tatarlık Bahsî' in *Mecmûa-ı Ebüzziya*, XXX, 94 (5 Cemaziyelevvel 1329/4 May 1911), p. 485.
- 15 'İfâde-i Merâm', pp. 1-2.
- 16 In 1910, Kâzım Nami [Duru] wrote down that nearly everybody called the 'Ottomans' cherished homeland Turkey', and that there is no difference in saying either 'Turkey' or the 'Ottoman lands'. Kâzım Nami [Duru], 'Türkçe mi, Osmanlıca mı?' in *Genç Kalemler Dergisi* (1910-12), İ. Parlatur and N. Çetin (eds) (Ankara: TDK, 1999), p. 40.
- 17 In the *TOE*'s membership list Ahmed Refik is described as 'Piyâde Yüzbaşılardan', or as an infantry captain. 'İfâde-i Merâm', p.8.
- 18 'İfâde-i Merâm', p. 2.
- 19 Hasan Akbayrak, *From Court History Recorder to an Official Historical Writing Society in Turkey: The Case of the Ottoman Historical Society* (unpublished M.A. dis-

- sertation, Boğaziçi University, 1987), p. 61 (Hereafter abridged to *From Court*).
- 20 Pierre Nora, 'Lavisse', pp. 151-2.
- 21 Tanpınar declares that Yahya Kemal had been affected deeply by Michelet's romantic interpretation of French history. Ahmed Refik also comments upon Michelet's romantic (nationalist) character, indicating that he should not be seen as an objective and impartial historian. A. H. Tanpınar, *Yahya Kemal*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1985), p. 24; Ahmed Refik, 'Michelet (1798-1874)' in *Yeni Mecmua*, 12, (27 September 1917), republished in *Fransız*, pp. 7-22; J. Michelet, 'Préface de 1869' in *Histoire de la France*, revised ed. (Paris, 1876), vol. I, p. VIII.
- 22 'Konuşmalar', p. 265.
- 23 Ahmed Râsim, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 4 vols (İstanbul, 1910-12).
- 24 Ahmed Râsim, *Osmanlı*, vol. II, pp. 353-5.
- 25 Mustafa Nuri, *Netâyic ül-Vukûât*, 4 vols, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Uhuvvat Matbaası, 1327/1911), vol.III, pp.27-8.
- 26 Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1927), p. 372.
- 27 Henri Pirenne is primarily remembered for his thesis positing a clean break between ancient and mediaeval times. He postulates that the Middle Ages began with the Muslim control of the Mediterranean. His insistence on providing causal links between events can be seen in the following quotation: '[I]a rupture de la tradition antique a eu pour instrument l'avance rapide et imprévue de l'Islam. Elle a eu pour conséquence de séparer définitivement l'Orient de l'Occident, en mettant fin à l'unité méditerranéenne'. H. Pirenne, *Mahomet et Charlemagne*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Paris and Brussels: Félix Alcan, 1937), p. 260.
- 28 Ercüment Kuran also opines that 'this is a work of synthesis on Ottoman history, which seeks to determine the causes and consequences of events'. *Mustafa Nuri Paşa: Netayic ül-vukuat. Kurum ve örgütleriyle Osmanlı Tarihi*, 4 vols, ed. N. Çağatay (Ankara: TTK, 1979), vol. I-II, p. XIII; E. Kuran, 'Ottoman Historiography of the Tanzimat Period', in B. Lewis and P. M. Holt (eds), *Historians of the Middle East* (London: OUP, 1962), p. 425.
- 29 A. Uçman, 'Encümen-i Dâniş', in *TDVİA*, vol. XI (1995), pp. 176-8.
- 30 Z. Arıkan, 'Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Tarihiçilik' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (1985), vol. VI, p. 1584; J. Schleifert, 'Cevdet Paşa' in *İA*, vol. III (1945), pp. 114-23; D. Günday, 'Tarih-i Cevdet'in neşri vesilesiyle', in *Tarih-i Cevdet*, ed. D. Günday (İstanbul: Sabah, 1972), vol. I, p. 11.
- 31 Richard L. Chambers, 'The Education of a Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Alim, Ahmed Cevdet Paşa' in *IJMES*, 4, 4 (October 1973), p. 464.
- 32 The treaty brought an end to the war that had erupted in 1768 and marked the opening move of the Russian annexation of the Crimea. *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'Empire ottoman*, ed. Gabriel Noradounghian (Paris: F. Pichon, 1897), vol. I, pp. 319-34.
- 33 J. Schleifert, 'Cevdet Paşa', p. 119.
- 34 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, 12 vols (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1270-1301/1854-84).
- 35 'Fazıl Ahmed Paşanın vefâtından Damad İbrahim Paşanın devrine gelince zuhûra gelen ahvâl-i muhtelif beyânındadır', pp. 25-38; 'İbrahim Paşa devrinden Ragıb

- Paşanın vefâtına kadar zuhura gelen etvâr-ı muhtelif beyânındadır', pp. 38-45 in *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I.
- 36 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 37.
- 37 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 38.
- 38 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 39.
- 39 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 39.
- 40 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 40.
- 41 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 40.
- 42 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 40.
- 43 A. H. Tanpınar, *Yahya*, p. 153.
- 44 İ. Kocakaplan, *Yahya Kemal'in Şiirlerinde Edebi Sanatlar* (İstanbul, unpublished Master's Thesis İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1990), pp. 103-5.
- 45 The influence of Nedim on Yahya Kemal has quite recently been remarked upon by the literary scholar Kemal Silay. Silay states that '[s]ome of his [Yahya Kemal] poems explicitly evoke the language and certain themes characteristic of Nedim'. Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar, for his part, does not shy away from employing the term 'Classical' or 'Neo-Classical' in connection with parts of Yahya Kemal's oeuvre, as a result of the fact that, rather than distancing himself from traditional Ottoman poetry, as had been standard practice since the *Tanzimat*, the poet attempted to actively embrace the language and style of ancient poetry. Kemal Silay, *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court. Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1994), p. 116; A. H. Tanpınar, *Yahya*, pp. 77 and 156; C. Tanyol, 'Yahya Kemal'in Dili ve Zevki', in *Türk Edebiyatında Yahya Kemal. İnceleme ve Anılar* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1985), pp. 48-53.
- 46 Yahya Kemal himself talks candidly about his personal discovery of Verlaine's poetry during his stay in Paris. Quite recently the literary scholar Emel Kefeli published an article about the relationship between Yahya Kemal's oeuvre and Verlaine's poetry. Yahya Kemal, *Çocukluğum, Gençliğim, Siyasi ve Edebi Hatıralarım* (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1986), p. 107; A. H. Tanpınar, *Yahya*, p. 148; Â. Kahraman, *Yahya*, p. 64; E. Kefeli, 'Yahya Kemal ve Fêtes Galantes' in *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat İncelemeleri* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2000), pp. 117-26.
- 47 S. Taylor-Horrex, *Verlaine: Fêtes galantes and Romances sans paroles* (London: Grant & Cutler, 1988), p. 25.
- 48 Charles Blanc, *Les peintres des fêtes galantes. Watteau, Lancret, Pater, Boucher* (Paris: J. Renouard, 1854); M. Song, *Art Theories of Charles Blanc 1813 - 1882* (Ann Arbor, Mich: UMI Research Press, 1984), p. 1.
- 49 S. Taylor-Horrex *Verlaine*, p. 26.
- 50 Nowadays, art-historical opinion tends to interpret the work in more critical and even political terms. Georgia Cowart, 'Watteau's Pilgrimage to Cythera and the Subversive Utopia of the opera-ballet' in *Art Bulletin* (September 2001).
- 51 The work *L'Art du XVIIIe siècle*, written by the Goncourt brothers jointly, had been originally published between 1859 and 1875 in twelve 'fascicules'. S. Rocheblave, *L'art et le goût en France de 1600 à 1900* (Paris: Colin, 1923).
- 52 E. and J. de Goncourt, *L'art du XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1896), vol. I, p. 3.
- 53 Emel Kefeli voiced a similar contention, indicating that Verlaine's usage of eighteenth-century language had encouraged Yahya Kemal to read *Divan* poetry. E. Ke-

- feli, 'Yahya', p. 119.
- 54 F. Abdullah Tansel, 'NEDİM' in *LA*, vol. IX (1960), p. 169.
- 55 Kemal Silay, *Nedim*, p. XI.
- 56 H. Mazioğlu, *Nedim'in Divan Şiirlerinde Getirdiği Yenilik* (Ankara: TTK, 1957), pp. 39 and 43.
- 57 F. Abdullah Tansel in *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IX, p. 169.
- 58 A. H. Tanpınar, *Yahya*, p. 154.
- 59 A. H. Tanpınar, *Yahyalı*, p. 154.
- 60 Yahya Kemal, *Eski Şiirin Rüzgârıyla* (İstanbul: Fetih Cemiyeti, 1962), p. 31.
- 61 An *imâle* is an affectation consisting of the pronunciation of a short vowel as a long one, absent in Turkish words *stricto sensu*. *Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*, 12<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul, 1991), p. 532.
- 62 Yahya Kemal, *Eski*, p. 31.
- 63 Ö. F. Akün, 'Osmanlı Tarihi Karşısında Yahya Kemal'in Şiiri' in *KAM*, V, 2 (1976), p. 13; C. Tanyol, 'Yahya Kemal ve Mazi' in *Türk Edebiyatında Yahya Kemal*, pp. 84-6.
- 64 This book is purportedly based upon his earlier published French work on the same topic, *l'art turc* published in 1909. Celâl Esad [Arseven], *Türk Sanatı* (İstanbul: Akşam Matbaası, 1928), mukaddime, p. 3.
- 65 Celâl Esad, *Türk*, p. 169.
- 66 Joseph von Hammer knew ten languages (Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Italian, French, English, German). I. H. Solbrig, *Hammer-Purgstall und Goethe. "Dem Zaubermeister das Werkzeug"* (Bern and Frankfurt: H. Lang, 1973), pp. 45-6 and 48-9; İlber Ortaylı, 'Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph Freiherr von' in *TDVİA*, vol. XIV, pp. 491-4.
- 67 J. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, grossentheils auf bisher unbenützten Handschriften und Archiven*, 10 vols, (Pest, 1827-35).
- 68 J. de Hammer, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman: depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours*, 18 vols, (Paris: Bellizard, Barthès, Dufour & Lowell, 1835-43).
- 69 According to Neumann the *Encümen-i Daniş* contained 40 full members ('aslı'), whose allegiance was beyond doubt as Muslim citizens of the Ottoman state, as well as 30 external members from the various other Ottoman communities such as Greeks and Armenians. Additionally, renowned European figures such as Hammer and Sir James Redhouse were also numbered among these 'special' members of the *Encümen*. A. Uçman, 'Encümen-i Dâniş' in *TDVİA*, vol. XI (1995), pp. 176-8., pp. 177-8; Ch. K. Neumann, *Araç*, p. 15.
- 70 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, p. 82.
- 71 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, p. 82.
- 72 Celâl Esad [Arseven] *Eski Galata ve Mebânileri* (İstanbul, 1329/1913).
- 73 Celâl Esad, *Eski*, p. 73.
- 74 Walter Denny, 'Dating Ottoman Turkish Works in the Saz Style' in *Muğarnas*, I (1983), pp. 103-21; Banu Mahir, 'Saray Nakkaşhanesinin ünlü Ressamı Şah Kulu ve Eserleri' in *TSY*, 1 (1986), pp. 113-30.
- 75 Walter Denny, 'Saz Style', p. 104; A. S. Ünver, *Ali Üsküdarî ve Eserleri* (İstanbul: TEGE, 1954).
- 76 Walter Denny, 'Saz Style', pp. 107 and 118; Banu Mahir, 'Saray Nakkaşhanesi', pp. 113-



- 30; A. Ersoy, *Türk Tezhip Sanatı* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 1988), p. 36.
- 77 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, pp. 186-7.
- 78 See *footnote* (61).
- 79 Yahya Kemal, *Eski*, p. 54
- 80 Yahya Kemal, *Eski*, p. 30.
- 81 In particular Tanpınar refers to the poem *Hérodiade*, which has been termed 'byzantinist' by many a critic. A. H. Tanpınar, *Yahya*, p. 158; A. Thibaudet, 'Hérodiade' in *La poésie de Stéphane Mallarmé. Étude littéraire* (Paris: M. Rivière, 1926), pp. 387-92.
- 82 'Konuşmalar', p. 265.
- 83 Ahmed Refik published a three-part article on Albert Vandal, later republished in book form. Ahmed Refik, 'Albert Vandal (1850-1910)' in *İkdam*, 9058, 5 June 1922; 9062, 9 June 1922; 9065, 12 June 1922; Ahmed Refik, *Fransız*, pp. 41-56.

## Chapter I/2

The Construction of the 'Tulip Age': Ahmed Refik and his *Lâle Devri*,

1913-15

- Ahmed Refik, *Lâle Devri* (1130-1143), 1<sup>st</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Muhtar Halit Kütüphanesi, 1331/1915), pp. 60-1. (Hereafter abridged to *Lâle*).
- 1 The *malî* (fiscal) year 1328 lasted from March 1912 till March 1913. Ahmed Refik, 'Ahmed-i Sâlis Devrinde Sultan Dügünleri. Bir Sultanın Hissiyatı' in *Şebbal*, III, 54 (1 June 1328/1912), p. 116.
  - 2 Ahmed Refik, 'Sultanın Hissiyatı', p. 116.
  - 3 Ahmed Refik, 'Moralî Âli Efendinin Pâris Sefâreti (1797-1802)' in *TOEM*, III, (1328/1912), pp. 1120-37.
  - 4 İstanbul, 'İkdam' in *DBĀA*, vol. IV (1994), p. 145.
  - 5 David Kushner remarked insightfully that '[a]mong Istanbul newspapers, it was *İkdam* in particular which . . . concentrated attention on Turkish history' in the last years of the nineteenth century'. David Kushner, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism 1876-1908* (London: Cass, 1977), pp. 29-30.
  - 6 N. Yüce, 'Ahmed Cevdet, İkdamcı' in *DBĀA*, vol. II (1989), pp. 55-6.
  - 7 N. Yüce, 'Ahmed Cevdet, İkdamcı', p. 55.
  - 8 The serialisation began on 9 March 1913, corresponding to 24 February 1328. But 14 March 1913 marked the beginning of the new year of the *Malî* or *Rumî* calendar, 1 March 1329. F. R. Unat, *Hicrî Tarihleri Milâdî Tarihe Çevirme Kılavuzu*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (Ankara: TTK, 1994), p. 136.
  - 9 References to Tayyarzâde Atâ: *Lâle*, pp. 13, 36, 111, 141.
  - 10 Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 376.
  - 11 References to Râşid: *Lâle*, pp. 37, 38, 70, 86.
  - 12 References to Çelebizâde Asım: *Lâle*, pp. 76, 78, 82, 92, 94, 98, 104, 115, 117.
  - 13 References to Subhî: *Lâle*, pp. 81, 104, 117, 118, 128, 132, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 152.
  - 14 References to Naimâ: *Lâle*, pp. 149 and 150.
  - 15 Ahmed Refik makes three separate references to this source: *Lâle*, pp. 116, 125, 140.
  - 16 In 1943, Faik Reşid Unat's edition of an hitherto unknown source relating to the Patrona Halil rebellion, *Abdî Tarihi*, contains the acknowledgment that he had been unable to locate the defter compiled by 'a certain' Mehmed Hulusi Efendi, the *Şam Hazinesi Rûznameçisi. 1730 Patrona İhtilâlü Hakkında Bir Eser: Abdî Tarihi*, ed. F. R. Unat (Ankara: TTK, 1943), p. X.
  - 17 References to the *Teşrifât Defteri*: *Lâle*, pp. 51, 53, 58, 68.
  - 18 Reference to a *Hatt-ı Şerif* issued by Mahmud I: *Lâle*, p. 160.
  - 19 *Mémoires sur l'ambassade de France en Turquie, 1525 - 1740, par François Emmanuel Guignard, Comte de Saint-Priest*, ed. Charles Schefer (Paris: E. Leroux, 1894) (Reprint Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1974).
  - 20 References to De Bonac: *Lâle*, pp. 15, 16, 18, 19, 111.
  - 21 References to letters written by De Bonac: *Lâle*, pp. 93 and 97.
  - 22 The reference to Schefer's work: *Lâle*, p. 87.
  - 23 References to Lady Montagu: *Lâle*, pp. 32, 68, 84, 88, 108.
  - 24 References to Vincent Mignot: *Lâle*, pp. 119, 125 and 139.
  - 25 Auguste Boppe, *Les peintres du Bosphore au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1911); Albert Vandal, *Une ambassade française en orient sous Louis XV, la mission du mar-*

- quis de Villeneuve 1728-1741* (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et cie., 1887). Reference to Auguste Boppe: *Lâle*, p. 61, references to Albert Vandal: *Lâle*, pp. 109 and 122.
- 26 One reference was made to Waliszewski: *Lâle*, p. 92, as 'Vâlizevski'. K. Waliszewski, *Pierre le Grand*, 2 vols (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit & Cie., 1897).
- 27 S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 305.
- 28 Ahmed Refik, 'Lâle Devri' in *İkdam* (9 March 1913), nr. 5763, p. 2.
- 29 M. Kaplan, *Tevfik Fikret ve Şiiri* (İstanbul: Türkiye yayinevi, 1946).
- 30 N. Berkes, *The Development*, p. 300.
- 31 S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 305.
- 32 Y. Nabi, *Tevfik Fikret. Hayatı - Sanatı - Şiirleri*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Varlık, 1967), pp. 3-6.
- 33 Y. Nabi, *Tevfik*, pp. 85-8 (86).
- 34 Y. Nabi, *Tevfik*, p. 4; S. Sertel, *İlericilik, Gericilik Kavgasında Tevfik Fikret*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları, 1996), p. 53.
- 35 Y. Nabi, *Tevfik*, p. 5.
- 36 The power of the Islamic argument at the time was such that even '[n]ationalists founded [a] periodical for the reform of Islam in 1914', entitled *İslâm Mecmûası*, which tried to reconcile the Turkist argument with the precepts of Islam (63 issues appearing between February 1914 and October 1918). According to Şerif Mardin the Islamist or Pan-Islamist ideal appeared in the 1890s, and he further maintains that Yusuf Akçura had recognised that Abdülhamid II attempted to substitute Islamism for Ottomanist ideas. The term Pan-Islamism seems to have been first popularised by the Frenchman Gabriel Charmes, writing in the 1880s, who had argued that the Ottomans had to effect a policy-shift towards a more Islamic position in view of the practical unfeasibility of the ideal of Ottomanism. Quite recently Selim Deringil has also argued that the ideal of 'Ottomanism', which he describes as 'a sort of "Imperial supranationalism"', became 'more Islamic in tone during the reign of Abdülhamid II'. Zafer Toprak, 'II. Meşrutiyet', pp. 126-7; Bülent Varlık, 'Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet Dergileri' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1, p. 122; Masami Arai, *Turkish Nationalism*, pp.83-4; Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerinin Siyasi Fikirleri*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: İletişim, 1989), p.59-60; Gabriel Charmes, *L'avenir de la Turquie: le panislamisme* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1883); Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains. Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998), p. 46.
- 37 On 23 January 1913, '[a] group of Unionist officers rode to the [Sublime] Porte, burst into the room where the cabinet was in session' and subsequently killed various government members and set up '[a] new cabinet', initially placing Mahmud Şevket Paşa in charge of the Grand Vizirate and the War Ministry. But, it has been argued, real power was wielded by the 'triumvirate Talat-Enver-Cemal'. E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey*, p. 113.
- 38 Ahmed Refik's *İki Komite, İki Kutâl* (published in book form in the course of 1919) had been based on notes compiled in 1915, and was first published in *İkdam* between 17 December 1918 and 18 January 1919. Ahmed Refik, *Kafkas Yollarında İki Komite İki Kutâl*, ed. O. S. Kocahanoğlu (İstanbul: Temel, 1998), pp. 14, 16 and 133.
- 39 *Lâle*, p. 1.
- 40 *Lâle*, p. 1.
- 41 *Lâle*, p. 1.
- 42 *Lâle*, pp. 1-2.
- 43 *Lâle*, p. 2.

- 44 *Lâle*, p. 2.
- 45 *Lâle*, p. 2.
- 46 *Lâle*, p. 2.
- 47 *Lâle*, p. 3.
- 48 *Lâle*, p. 6.
- 49 *Lâle*, p. 6.
- 50 Tim Chapman, *The Congress of Vienna. Origins, processes and results* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), pp. 16-32.
- 51 *Lâle*, p. 6.
- 52 *Lâle*, pp. 8-9.
- 53 *Lâle*, p. 10.
- 54 *Lâle*, pp. 10-1.
- 55 *Lâle*, p. 12.
- 56 *Lâle*, p. 12.
- 57 *Tarih-i Atâ*, 5 vols (İstanbul, 1293/1876). (Information on Damad İbrahim: vol. II, pp. 152-65).
- 58 *Hadikat ül-Vüzerâ* (İstanbul, 11271/1854-5), facsimile ed. (Freiburg: D. Robischon, 1969), [II] pp. 29-36 ('Damad İbrahim Paşa').
- 59 Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 254; *Hadikat ül-Vüzerâ*, [I] pp. 128-32.
- 60 This *zeyl* contained an account of Ahmed III and Mahmud I's Grand Vezirs. *Hadikat ül-Vüzerâ*, [II], pp. 2-86.
- 61 *Lâle*, p. 93.
- 62 The reference reads 'Marki Döbônâkın Fransa Hariciyye Nezâretine mektûbu, 14 Kanûn-ı Sâni 1724'. *Lâle*, p. 93.
- 63 Ahmed Refik, *Küçük Tarih-i Osmani* (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i İslam ve Askeri, 1327/1911-12), pp. 57-8. In the book's chronological division of Ottoman history, Ahmed Refik sees the 'Era of Renewal' ('Devr-i Teceddüd') as commencing in 1203/1789, the year of Selim III's accession to the throne.
- 64 Ahmed Refik, *Osmanlı Tarihine Dâir Nefer Ne Bilmelidir* (İstanbul, 1328/1912-13), pp. 60-2.
- 65 S. J. Shaw, 'The Origins of Ottoman Military Reform: The Nizam-ı Cedid Army of Sultan Selim III' in *JMH*, XXXVII, 3 (September 1965), pp. 291-306; S. J. Shaw, *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III, 1789-1807* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1971).
- 66 Christoph Neumann remarks that it is actually quite difficult in modern historiography to link the figure of one individual sultan with the promulgation of reform policies, but, he continues, Ahmed Cevdet openly proclaimed such a connection between Selim III and the reform of the Ottoman Empire. He furthermore advances the point that Cevdet's influence on the writings of later generations can be felt as far as Enver Ziya Karal and Stanford J. Shaw in their work on Selim III. Ch. K. Neumann, *Amaç*, footnote 91, p. 31.
- 67 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, p. 39.
- 68 The footnote reference simply reads 'Dübonâkın Sefâretnâmesi, s 223'. *Lâle*, p. 111.
- 69 According to Schefer, Cardinal Alberoni, 'premier ministre de la Cour d'Espagne' had conceived a plan to regain the former Bourbon possessions of Sardinia and Sicily during the negotiations of the Passarowitz treaty. This scheme would have involved a Spanish attack on the Habsburgs from the West, backed by Rakóczy and his newly-formed regiment attacking the Austrians in the East. For this purpose the idea of setting up this 'régiment de hussards' had been suggested to the Ottomans at the time. *Mémoires*, pp. 118-9, 257.

- 70 Ahmed Refik wrote down 'Atâ, Enderûn Tarihi, cild 2, s 53,' *Lâle*, p. 111.
- 71 *Tarih-i Atâ*, vol. II, p. 156.
- 72 *Tarih-i Atâ*, vol. II, p. 156.
- 73 Berkes provides an interesting reading of this text. N. Berkes, *The Development*, pp. 42-5.
- 74 Earlier in Ahmed III's reign the *Defterdâr* Sarı Mehmed composed such a work and presented it to the Grand Vezir (*Ottoman Statecraft. The Book of Counsel for Vezirs and Governors*, ed. W. L. Wright, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1935). C. E. Bosworth, 'Nasihât al-Muluk' in *EI*, new ed. (1993), vol. VII, pp. 984-8.
- 75 C. E. Bosworth, 'Nasihât al-Muluk', p. 984.
- 76 B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, p. 47.
- 77 According to Berkes, Müteferrika showcases three forms of government present in Europe: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. He calls this presentation of socio-political systems, 'the first of its kind in any modern Muslim country'. N. Berkes, *The Development*, p. 42.
- 78 Berkes calls this section a 'detailed description of the new military methods used in the West'. N. Berkes, *The Development*, p. 44.
- 79 B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, p. 47.
- 80 İbrahim Müteferrika, *Usûl ül-Hikem fi Nizâm ül-Ümem* (İstanbul, 1144/1732), p. 39 verso.
- 81 İbrahim Müteferrika, *Usûl ül-Hikem*, p. 31 recto.
- 82 J. Childs, *Armies and Warfare in Europe 1648-1789* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1982), p. 28; E. Robson, 'The Armed Forces and the Art of War' in J. O. Lindsay, *The New Cambridge Modern History, Volume VII: The Old Regime 1713-63* (Cambridge: CUP, 1957), pp. 163-89.
- 83 İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları I. Acemi Ocağı ve Yeniçeri Ocağı* (Ankara: TTK, 1943), pp. 145, 155, 411; İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları II. Cebeci, Topçu, Top Arabacılar, Lağımçı Ocakları ve Kapukulu Suvarileri* (Ankara: TTK, 1944), pp. 3, 35, 97, 117, 131; M. İlgürel, 'Yeniçeriler' in *İA*, vol. XIII (1986), pp. 385-95; Rh. Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 25 and 43.
- 84 İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Kapukulu Ocakları I*, pp. 477-8.
- 85 Lewis claims that the text had been originally written during Ahmed III's reign. J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, p. 494; B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, p. 47; N. Berkes, 'Historical Background of Turkish Secularism' in R. N. Frye (ed.), *Islam and the West* (The Hague: Mouton, 1957), p. 51.
- 86 After the dissolution of the Janissaries in 1826 a standing army was set up. The great reformer of the *Tanzimat*, Mustafa Reşid, gave the army the name *Asâkir-i Nizâmiyye-i Şahâne* in 1841. S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 85.
- 87 *Tarih-i Atâ*, vol. II, p. 156.
- 88 In the first volume of his *Tarih*, Ahmed Atâ had already referred to Müteferrika's text and Damad İbrahim's efforts to respond to Müteferrika's admonitions in the form of the organisation of a body of 300 trained soldiers in Üsküdar. *Tarih-i Atâ*, vol. I, p. 157.
- 89 *Tarih-i Râşid* (İstanbul, 1282/1865), vol. VI (*Tarih-i Çelebizâde Efendi*).
- 90 Çelebizâde gives a detailed account of the reasons behind the Ottoman bid to occupy the lands formerly held by the Safavids by way of preamble to the numerous subsequent entries dealing with the various battles and conquests. *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. VI, pp. 61-4 ('Sebeb-i Zuhûr-ı Sefer-i İrân'); 64-5 ('Sûret-i Fetvâ-ı Şerife').
- 91 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. VI, pp. 489-90.

- 92 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. VI, p. 489.
- 93 A. Halaçoğlu, 'Humbaracı' in *TDVİA* (1998), vol. XVIII, pp. 349-50; A. Özcan, 'Humbaracı Ahmed Paşa' in *TDVİA* (1998), vol. XVIII, pp. 351-3, A. Vandal, *Le pacha Bonneval* (Paris: L. Cerf, 1885), pp. 36-8.
- 94 N. Berkes, *The Development*, p. 47.
- 95 According to Berkes this information can be found in the *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî* (1198/1784), p. 58 *recto*. N. Berkes, *The Development*, p. 48.
- 96 Berkes deals at length with the *Tarih-i Atâ*, but does not even reproduce the claim relating to Damad İbrahim's military project. N. Berkes, *The Development*, pp. 48 and 54.
- 97 B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, pp. 69-72; N. Berkes, *The Development*, pp. 82-5.
- 98 S. F. Göncüoğlu, 'Humbarahane Kışlası ve Camii' in *TDVİA* (1998), vol. XVIII, pp. 353-4.
- 99 *Lâle*, p. 34.
- 100 *Lâle*, p. 34.
- 101 *Lâle*, p. 34.
- 102 Ernest Mânbüri [Mamboury], *İstanbul Rehber-i Seyyahin* (İstanbul: Rizzo ve Mahdumu, 1925), pp. 339-40.
- 103 *Lâle*, p. 35.
- 104 Ahmed Refik first aired this rather crucial claim on Thursday, 13 March 1913/28 February 1328, in the fifth instalment of his book in *İkdam*. Ahmed Refik, 'Lâle Devri' in *İkdam*, no. 5767 (13 March 1913/28 February 1328), p. 2.
- 105 R. Gildea, *The Past in French History* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1994), p. 2.
- 106 The Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 had greatly impressed the Ottoman civil and military bureaucracy and this adulation of German efficiency continued throughout the Second Constitutional period as well. İlber Ortaylı, *İkinci Abdülhamit Döneminde Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Alman Nüfuzu* (Ankara: S.B.F.Yayınları, 1981), pp. 46 and 71.
- 107 Charles Seignobos, *Histoire de la civilisation au moyen age et dans les temps modernes* (Paris: Masson et cie, 1887); *Charles Seignobos: Tarih-i Medeniyet. Kurun-ı Vusta ve Ezmine-i Cedide*, 3 vols, ed. Ahmed Refik (İstanbul, 1328/1912).
- 108 'Muharririmize Neler Anlatıyor', p. 33.
- 109 Charles Seignobos, *Histoire*, p. 50.
- 110 The fact that Seignobos is very laudatory about the Arabs, their culture and their contribution to the development of European civilisation ('Onuncu Fasil. Garbde Medeniyet-i Şarkiyye') must have been quite hard to take for the Ottomans, who had seen themselves as representative of Islam since the early sixteenth century and Selim I's appropriation of the Holy Cities and the Ottomans' subsequent espousal of the caliphal cause, from the reign of Süleyman onwards. This probably was the reasoning behind Ahmed Refik's addition of a chapter entitled 'Osmanlı Medeniyeti' to Seignobos' book. He lists among others the *Netâ'ic ül-Vukûât*, Atâ's books and Hayreddin Efendi's Ottoman history as sources for the chapter. *Charles Seignobos: Tarih-i Medeniyet*, pp. 174-86 ('Onuncu Fasil'), 187-91 ('Onbirinci Fasil. Osmanlı Medeniyeti').
- 111 Charles Seignobos, *Histoire*, p. 57.
- 112 Charles Seignobos, *Histoire*, p. 58.
- 113 The book's publication in these European languages clearly betrays its true portent as a propagandistic stunt directed at a Western audience. The French translation was prepared by Marie De Launay. *Usûl-i mimari-i Osmani*, ed. İbrahim Edhem Paşa (Dersaadet, 1873); *L'architecture Ottomane, ouvrage autorisé par iradé impér-*

- ial, et publié sous le patronage de Son Excellence Edhem Pacha, pour l'Exposition Universelle de 1873 à Vienne*, ed. Edhem Pacha, (Constantinople, Imprimerie et Lithographie Centrales, 1873), 'VII. Monographie de la fontaine de Sultan Ahmed III à Bab-i-Houmaïoun'.
- 114 *L'architecture Ottomane*, VII, p. 59.
- 115 Ahmed Refik, 'Lâle Devri [5]', in *İkdam*, no. 5767 (13 March 1913/28 February 1328), p. 2.
- 116 Halide Edib [Adıvar], *Turkey faces West* (New Haven, Ct, 1930), p. 158.
- 117 During the Republican era Ahmed Refik wrote a more detailed piece on this fountain in the daily *Akşam*. Ahmed Refik, 'Üçüncü Ahmed Çeşmesi' in *Akşam*, (28 February 1936).
- 118 In this instance he refers to the work of the historian Tayyazâde Ahmed Ata. (*Tarih-i Ata*, vol. II, p. 108). *Lâle*, pp. 35-6.
- 119 *Lâle*, p. 36.
- 120 *Lâle*, p. 36.
- 121 *Lâle*, p. 36.
- 122 *Lâle*, pp. 36-7.
- 123 *Lâle*, p. 37.
- 124 The historian refers to the work of the then current *vakanüvis* Râşid in this instance: 'Tarih-i Râşid, cild 5, s 443'. *Lâle*, p. 37.
- 125 The date is provided in later editions of the text in the 'new' Turkish alphabet. Ahmed Refik, *Lâle Devri*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., (Istanbul, s.d.), p. 30.
- 126 *Lâle*, p. 37. As a matter of fact, the holdings of the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris contain Lenoir's book, entitled *Nouvelle description de la ville de Constantinople, avec la relation du voyage de l'ambassadeur de la Porte Ottomane & de son séjour à la Cour de France*, but unfortunately, I have not been able to consult this book.
- 127 *L'architecture Ottomane*, p. 66.
- 128 *L'architecture Ottomane*, p. 66-7.
- 129 Robert Gildea pointed out how the French historian had not shied away from utilising his trade in a way that could prove politically motivated: 'Albert Vandal, in his study of the alliance of Napoleon and Alexander in 1807, sought to show how the Emperor had escaped diplomatic isolation, and had anticipated the Franco-Russian alliance of 1891-2'. R. Gildea, *The Past*, p. 105.
- 130 'Discours de M. A. Vandal de l'Académie française', in F. Charles, A. Leroy-Beaulieu, e.a., *Les Questions actuelles de politique étrangère en Europe* (Paris, 1911), p. 238; D. Cochin, *Quatre français: Pasteur, Chevreul, Brunetière, Vandal* (Paris: Hachette, 1912), p. 265; M. Conway, *Catholic Politics in Europe 1918-1945* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 1-2.
- 131 Ahmed Refik, 'Albert Vandal (1850-1910)' in *İkdam*, 9058, (5 June 1922); 9062, (9 June 1922), 9065, (12 June 1922), republished in his *Fransız*, pp. 41-56.
- 132 The French historian's works dealing with Ottoman topics are the following: Albert Vandal, *Le pacha Bonneval* (Paris: L. Cerf, 1885); Albert Vandal, *Une ambassade française en orient sous Louis XV. La mission du Marquis de Villeneuve 1728-1741* (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, 1887); Albert Vandal, *Les Arméniens et la réforme de la Turquie* (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, 1897); Albert Vandal, *L'odyssée d'un ambassadeur. Les voyages du Marquis de Nointel (1670-1680)* (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie, 1900).
- 133 Ahmed Refik did not hide his admiration for this book, stating that, in it, Vandal had portrayed early eighteenth-century French foreign policy in a 'clear' and 'attractive' style. Ahmed Refik, *Fransız*, p. 54.

- 134 Ahmed Refik, *Fransız*, p. 54; *Recueil d'actes*, pp. 243-67; M. A. Laugier, *Histoire des négociations pour la paix conclue à Belgrade*, 2 vols, (Paris: Vve Duchesne, 1768); L. Cassels, *The Struggle for the Ottoman Empire, 1717-1740* (London: Murray, 1966); K. A. Roider, *The Reluctant Ally: Austria's Policy in the Austro-Turkish War, 1737-1719* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972).
- 135 Ahmed Refik had been particularly impressed by the Frenchman's ability to synthesise information and render the events in a style, at the same time precise and objective, yet enjoyable and engaging. He proclaimed Albert Vandal to have been one of the great historians of the nineteenth century. Ahmed Refik, *Fransız*, pp. 41 and 49.
- 136 A. Vandal, *ambassade*, p. 85 and 90.
- 137 *Lâle*, pp. 58-9.
- 138 *Lâle*, p. 61.
- 139 *Lâle*, p. 61.
- 140 *Lâle*, p. 61. Ahmed Refik supplies the following footnote: 'Ogüst Bôp, Onsekizinci Asırda Boğaziçi Ressamları, s 12:35'. At a later date he also wrote an article on Boppe and his work as an historian; Ahmed Refik, 'Mösyö (Bôp) ve Eserleri' in *İkdam*, 8693, (26 May 1921).
- 141 The letter is kept in the French Archives: Affaires étrangères, Turquie, vol. 64, fol. 199; Auguste Boppe, *Les peintres*, p. 17, footnote 1; Auguste Boppe, *Les peintres*, pp. 12-35.
- 142 *Mercur de France* (June 1724, Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1969), pp. 1251-1264/330-333.
- 143 Albert Vandal, *ambassade*, p.83.
- 144 Albert Vandal, *ambassade*, pp.83 and 86.
- 145 Another example of such a perception can be found in the nineteenth-century reputation of the Habsburg Emperor Rudolf II (1576-1612). Nineteenth-century historians saw the Emperor as a melancholy figure, who, rather than dealing with the political realities of his day, had withdrawn into his patronage of the occult sciences and fine arts. Rudolf moved the court to Prague, where he withdrew from politics leaving the Empire's administration in the hands of his ministers. R. J. W. Evans, *Rudolf II and his World. A Study in Intellectual History 1576-1612* (Oxford: OUP, 1973), p. 44; R. J. W. Evans, 'Rudolf II and his Historians' in *Prag um 1600. Beiträge zur Kunst und Kultur am Hofe Rudolfs II.* (Wien: Luca, 1988), pp. 45-50.
- 146 In the period 1634-37 the tulip trade in the Netherlands led to increasing speculation reaching an early climax so that subsequently the markets collapsed. Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Collins, 1987).
- 147 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, p. 65.
- 148 Cfr. chapter I/1, p. 11.
- 149 *Lâle*, p. 39.
- 150 *Lâle*, pp. 39-40.
- 151 *Lâle*, p. 40.
- 152 The treaty had been signed in 1606. Gustav Bayerle, 'The Compromise at Zsitvatorok' in *AO*, VI, (1980), pp. 22-28.
- 153 Theodor Vetter, *Johann Rudolf Schmid. Freiherr von Schwarzenborn. Nachrichten über sein Leben und Wirken* (Frauenfeld, 1890), pp. 10-14; *Recueil d'actes*, pp. 39-49.
- 154 Theodor Vetter, *Johann*, pp. 13-4.
- 155 *Lâle*, p. 65.



- 156 *Lâle*, p. 66.
- 157 *Lâle*, p. 66.
- 158 Ahmed Râsim, *Osmanlı*, vol.II, p.359.
- 159 Mustafa Nuri, *Netâyic*, vol.III, p.30.
- 160 Mustafa Nuri, *Netâyic*, vol.III, p.30.
- 161 *Lâle*, p. 66.
- 162 *Lâle*, pp. 66-7.
- 163 *Lâle*, p. 67.
- 164 In tandem with the huge number of political publications that emerged following the constitutional revolution of 23/4 July 1908, numerous titles catering for an all-female audience and oftentimes also wholly produced and owned by a female staff appeared as well. These periodicals carried such names as *Şükûfîzâr*, *Seyyale*, *Kadınlar Dünyası*, *Siyânet* or *Diyâne*. Serpil Çakır, *Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1994), p. 40.
- 165 Nevertheless some employment figures do exist for the Oriental Carpet Manufacturers Limited. This commercial organisation employed 15,000 female workers in 1910. Ş. Güzel, 'Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Toplumsal Değişim ve Kadın' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 4, pp. 869-70; D. Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), pp. 110-39; Ş. Pamuk, *The Ottoman Empire and European Capitalism, 1820-1913* (Cambridge: CUP, 1987); M. Zilfi, *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- 166 Ş. Güzel, 'Feminizm Üzerine Görüşler' in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 4, pp. 875-6.,
- 167 Ahmed Refik, 'Ahmed-i Sâlis Devrinde Osmanlı Hanımları' in *Şehbal*, III, 53, (15 May 1912/1328), p. 90.
- 168 The reference reads 'Mâdâm Möntegü, Şark Mektûbları: cild 1, 1717'.
- 169 *Lâle*, p. 68.
- 169 *Lâle*, p. 69.
- 170 *Lâle*, p. 69.
- 171 *Lâle*, p. 69.
- 172 *Lâle*, p. 69.
- 173 *Lâle*, pp. 69-70.
- 174 *Lâle*, p. 103.
- 175 *Lâle*, p. 104.
- 176 *Lâle*, p. 104.
- 177 According to Hüseyin Atay the atmosphere of intellectual freedom, enveloping the Ottoman dominions following the second proclamation of the constitution in 1908, had led to a lively debate in the public sphere on the role of the institution of the *medrese* and the role of the *ulema*. Hüseyin Atay, *Osmanlılarda Yüksek Din Eğitimi. Medrese Programları - İcazetnâmeler - İslahat Hareketleri* (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1983), p. 145.
- 178 Şemseddin's articles were written during the Balkan Wars, and meant to serve as exemplary historical instances to inspire the population. Şemseddin [Günaltay], 'Müterredî Medreseler ve Mazarratları' in *Zulmetden Nûra* (İstanbul: Tevsi Tibaat Matbaası, 1341/1925), pp. 145-51.
- 179 Şemseddin [Günaltay], 'Müterakkî Medreseler ve Hizmetleri' in *Zulmetden Nûra*, p. 140; Hüseyin Atay, *Osmanlılarda*, p. 232.
- 180 Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu claims that the idea that Mehmed II had set up a *medrese* system that included the teaching of positive sciences as well as religious sciences as a

- precursor of the *Darülfünûn* (university), was a product of the second constitutional era. İhsanoğlu in particular refers to the article written by Emin Bey, published in the *İlmiyye Salnâmesi* (1334/1918), an appendix of the *Meşihat-ı Celile-i İslâmiyye Ceride-i Resmîyyesi*. It seems ironic that a publication of the office of the *Şeyhülislâm* (*Meşihat*) was to promote the idea that *medreses* had been engaged in the teaching of non-religious learning during Fatih's reign. İhsanoğlu points to Nâmık Kemal's *Evrâk-ı Perişan* (1289/1872) as the earliest text to have promoted such ideas. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, 'Osmanlı Medrese Tarihçiliğinin İlk Safhası (1916-1965) - Keşif ve Tasarlama Dönemi' in *Belleten*, CLXIV (August 2000), pp. 541-82; Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, 'Fâtih Külliyesi Medreseleri Ne Degildi! Tarih Yazıcılığı Bakımından Tenkit ve Değerlendirme Denemesi' in *Büyük Cihad'dan Frenk Fodulluğuna* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1996), pp. 39-84.
- 181 N. Sakaoğlu, 'Darü'l-Hilafetü'l-Âliyye Medresesi' in *DBLA*, vol. II (1994), pp. 564-5.
- 182 Quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, pp. 80-2.
- 183 *Lâle*, pp. 104-5.
- 184 *Lâle*, p. 105.
- 185 Şemseddin [Günaltay]. 'Sınıf-ı İlmiyyenin Tereddidi ve Müslümanların Cehâlete Sürüklenmesi' in *Zulmetden Nûra*, pp. 132-7.
- 186 İbrahim Hilmi [Çığırcaçan], *Maarifimiz ve Servet-i İlmiyyemiz Felâketlerimizin Esbâbı* (Dersaadet: Kitabhâne-i İslâm ve Askeriyye, 1329/1913).
- 187 It is interesting to note that İbrahim Hilmi persists in calling the Ottoman Empire a European state, in spite of the effects of the Balkan Wars (1912-13). İbrahim Hilmi, *Felâketlerimizin*, p. 6.
- 188 *Lâle*, p. 105.
- 189 *Lâle*, p. 106.
- 190 *Lâle*, p. 106.
- 191 *Lâle*, p. 106.
- 192 *Lâle*, p. 106.
- 193 *Lâle*, p. 107.
- 194 *Lâle*, p. 107.
- 195 *Lâle*, p. 107.
- 196 *Lâle*, p. 107.
- 197 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, p. 232.
- 198 Ahmed Refik, *Kadınlar Saltanatı (699-1027)*, vol. I (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1332/1916); Ahmed Refik, *Kadınlar Saltanatı (1027-1049)*, vol. II (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1332/1916); Ahmed Refik, *Kadınlar Saltanatı (1049-1058)*, vol. III (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1923); Ahmed Refik, *Kadınlar Saltanatı (1058-1094)*, vol. IV (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1923).
- 199 *Lâle*, p. 111.
- 200 *Lâle*, p. 111, cfr *supra*.
- 201 *Lâle*, pp. 112-3.
- 202 *Lâle*, pp. 112-3.
- 203 The historian explains that even Damad İbrahim's administration debased the coinage drastically to keep the population under its dominance. *Lâle*, p. 113.
- 204 Ahmed Refik discloses that a number of 'revolutions' had earlier taken place in the Ottoman lands, some even resulting in the execution of sultans. He argues that these revolts had in fact been nothing but instances of brigandism and lawlessness that had not given rise to positive results. *Lâle*, p. 113.
- 205 *Lâle*, pp. 113-4.
- 206 *Lâle*, p. 114.

- 207 David Farhi, 'The Şeriat as a Political Slogan - or the "Incident of the 31st March"' in *MES*, VII, 3 (October 1971), pp. 275-99.
- 208 David Farhi, 'The Şeriat', p. 275.
- 209 David Farhi, 'The Şeriat', pp. 291-4.
- 210 *Lâle*, p. 114.
- 211 Ahmed Râsim, *Osmanlı*, vol. II, pp. 360-1.
- 212 *Lâle*, pp. 114-5.
- 213 *Lâle*, p. 115.
- 214 *Lâle*, p. 115.
- 215 Ahmed Râsim clearly based his accusation on Nuri's text. Ahmed Râsim, *Osmanlı*, vol. II, p. 359; Mustafa Nuri, *Netâyic*, vol. III, p. 30.
- 216 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, p. 223. In this instance, Hammer claims to have based himself on the *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî*. He namely adds the footnote 'Soubhi, f.7' as his source.
- 217 The historian relates how soldiers, returned from the front, visited hamams where they told horror stories of the unspeakable behaviour of Iranian soldiers: they had cut off the noses of Ottoman soldiers, executed them unceremoniously and thrown Muslim children in the air to cut them up with their sabres. *Lâle*, p. 116.
- 218 *Lâle*, p. 116.
- 219 *Lâle*, p. 119.
- 220 *Lâle*, p. 119.
- 221 *Lâle*, pp. 119-20.
- 222 This relation of the meeting runs parallel to Ahmed Râsim as well as Joseph von Hammer's accounts. But in view of his accusation of Zülâlî and İspirizâde, Ahmed Refik probably owes a greater debt to the Austrian's volumes. *Lâle*, p. 127.
- 223 *Lâle*, p. 127.
- 224 *Lâle*, p. 135.
- 225 *Lâle*, pp. 138-9.
- 226 The reference is as follows: 'Minyo, Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniyye, cild 4, s 34.' *Lâle*, p. 139, footnote 1.
- 227 Giambattista Toderini, *De la littérature des Turcs* (Paris: Chez Poinçot, 1789), vol. III, p. 21.
- 228 Ahmed Refik also includes a reference to the Comte de Salaberry in the footnote relating to Mignot's quotation ('Şalâberi, Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniyye, cild 3, s 156'). M. de Salaberry, *Histoire de L'Empire Ottoman depuis sa fondation jusqu'à la paix d'Yassi en 1792* (Paris: Le Normant, 1813), vol. I, pp. VIII-IX.
- 229 *Lâle*, p. 144.
- 230 *Lâle*, p. 144.
- 231 *Lâle*, p. 144.
- 232 *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, pp. 43-4.
- 233 Sultan Mahmud's words sounded as follows: '[i]htirâkına rızâ-yı hümayûnüm yokdur ancak hedim ve tahribine ruhsat ve iznim olmuştur' The footnote's reference reads 'Tarih-i Subhî. s 11'. *Lâle*, p. 144.
- 234 H. F. Ozansoy, 'Ahmed Refik' in *Son Posta* (11 October 1937). Quoted in *Tarihî Sevdiren*, p. 63.
- 235 M. Koral Türk, 'Hasan Âli Yücel (1897-1961)' in *TvT*, XXVIII 166 (October 1997), pp. 19-21.
- 236 H.-Â. Yücel, 'Ahmed Refik', p. 61.
- 237 H.-Â. Yücel, 'Ahmed Refik', p. 61.
- 238 H.-Â. Yücel, 'Ahmed Refik', p. 61.

- 239 A picture of Ahmed Refik, illustrating one of his articles, was published in the periodical Şehbal, bearing the mentioned caption. By the late twentieth century, however, academic as well as public opinion had changed considerably. In the early 1980s, Metin Kunt, for example, easily dismissed the historian as having written 'populistic representations' of Ottoman history based on the important Ottoman chronicles Ahmed Refik, 'Osmanlı Hanımları', p. 90; Metin Kunt, 'Türkische Beiträge zur Untersuchung der Beziehungen zwischen dem Osmanischen und Habsburger-Reich' in Z. Abrahamowicz ea, *Die Türkenkriege in der historischen Forschung* (Wien: F. Deuticke, 1983), pp. 166.
- 240 Paul Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1938), p. 45.
- 241 Paul Wittek proclaims that '[f]rom the first appearance of the Ottomans, the principal factor in this political tradition was the struggle against their Christian neighbours, and this struggle never ceased to be of vital importance to the Ottoman Empire'. Paul Wittek, *The Rise*, p. 2.
- 242 *Lâle*, p. 12.
- 243 *Lâle*, pp. 24-5.
- 244 *Lâle*, pp. 76-8.
- 245 *Lâle*, p. 78.
- 246 Doktor Karaçon [Imre Karacsón], 'İbrahim Müteferrika' in *TOEM*, I, 3 (1-14 August 1326/1911), pp. 178-85.
- 247 Abdurrahman Şeref, *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniyye* (Dersaadet: Kurrebet Matbaası, 1315/1897-98).
- 248 Abdurrahman Şeref, *Fezleke*, p. 149.
- 249 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, p. 196.
- 250 *Lâle*, p. 81.
- 251 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. VI, pp. 255-7.
- 252 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. VI, p. 256.
- 253 *Lâle*, p. 80.
- 254 Maybe the Ottoman historian had simply remained faithful to Hammer's phraseology ('un fabrique de faïence bleue de Perse'), in the process loading the noun *fabrika* with a definite modernist meaning. *Lâle*, p. 81.
- 255 *Lâle*, p. 90.
- 256 Kâmil Paşa, *Tarih-i Siyâsî-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmaniyye* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ahmed İhsan, 1328/1325/1910), vol. II, p. 136.
- 257 Abdülhamid II dismissed Parliament (*Meclis-i Mebusan*) on 14 February 1878, ushering in his autocratic rule oftentimes referred to as an era of despotism or *istibdat*. S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 187.
- 258 He also provided these claims with references to Naimâ as well as Râşid. *Lâle*, p. 150.
- 259 *Lâle*, pp. 151-2.
- 260 *Lâle*, p. 151.
- 261 Akarlı claims that Abdülhamid II 'attributed a greater importance to the [Arab] provinces of the Ottoman Empire than his predecessors'. Engin Akarlı, 'Abdülhamid II's Attempts to Integrate Arabs into the Ottoman System' in D. Kushner (ed.), *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period: Political, Social, and Economic Transformation* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1986), pp. 74-89.
- 262 Akarlı sees Abdülhamid's reign leaning towards a 'reemphasis of the Islamic foundations . . . as a viable basis for social and political solidarity'. Engin Akarlı, 'Abdülhamid II', p. 85.

- 263 Nikkie Keddie simply pronounces that 'Sultan [Abdülhamid] must also have been aware of the propaganda value of having at his court and working in his behalf a man [Afghani] with a considerable reputation among many Muslims'. Nikki R. Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din "al-Afghani". A Political Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 58-9, 373-4.
- 264 According Butrus Abu Manneh, Abulhuda al-Sayyad wrote 212 pamphlets and books that praised Abdülhamid as the Caliph who held sway over the whole of the Islamic world between 1880 - 1909. Butrus Abu Manneh, 'Sultan Abdulhamid II and Shaikh Abulhuda al-Sayyadi' in *MES*, 15 (1979), p. 140.
- 265 Sultan Abdülhamid set up the Hijaz Railway connecting the holy city of Medina with Damascus; he subsequently permitted the German-led construction of the İstanbul-Baghdad railway. These new and modern means of communication ensured close central supervision of the Arab provinces but also boosted Arab allegiance to the Sultan as a result of this clear sign of imperial concern with the pilgrimage to the holy cities and his efforts to modernise the infrastructure of his Arabic subjects. J. Landau, *The Hijaz Railway* (Detroit, Mi.: Wayne State University Press, 1971); W. Ochsenswald, *Religion, Society and the State in Arabia. The Hijaz under Ottoman Control, 1840-1908* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State UP, 1984), pp.215-7.
- 266 Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks. Ottomanism, Arabism and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918* (Berkeley and London.: University of California Press, 1997), p. 36.
- 267 Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks*, p. 32.
- 268 Y. Sarınoy, *Türk milliyetçiliğinin Tarihî Gelişimi*, pp. 88-90; Z. N. Zeine, *Arab-Turkish Relations and the Emergence of Arab Nationalism* (Beirut: Khayat, 1958); S. Derinçil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, p. 175; [Mehmed] Ziyâ Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak - 1 -' in *Türk Yurdu*, III, 11 (1329/1913), p. 332.
- 269 Ahmed Refik completed Osman Nuri's critical study of Abdülhamid's political and personal life after the author's premature death, employing the signature 'A R'. Osman Nuri, *Abdülhamid-i Sâni ve Devr-i Saltanatı. Hayat-ı husûsiyyesi*, 3 vols (İstanbul Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1327/1911).

**Chapter I/3**  
**Calibrating the Idea of a 'Tulip Age': Ahmed Refik's Publications**  
**in the Period 1915-19**

- 1 *Lâle Devri (1130-1143)* was first published by Muhtar Halid in 1331/1915. This first publication was followed by three more editions in the same year by the company Kitabhâne-i İslâm ü Asleri led by Tüccarzâde İbrahim Hilmi. *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 381, no. 829.
- 2 Ahmed Refik, *Muhtasar Osmanlı Tarihi*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası, 1330/1914-15).
- 3 In fact, the Morea, which had been lost to the Venetians in 1699, was regained by the Ottomans in 1715, and this gain was to be confirmed by the Treaty of Passarowitz (*Uti Possidetis*). Jeremy Black, *The Rise of the European Powers 1679-1793* (London: Edward Arnold, 1990), p. 69; Ahmed Refik, *Muhtasar*, p. 101.
- 4 Ahmed Refik, *Muhtasar*, p. 103.
- 5 Ahmed Refik, *Muhtasar*, p. 103.
- 6 Ahmed Refik, *Muhtasar*, p. 104.
- 7 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 32-4.
- 8 Ahmed Refik, *Muhtasar*, p. 104.
- 9 Ahmed Refik, *Tarihi Simâlar* (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Askeri, 1331/1915-16).
- 10 'Muharririmize Neler Anlatıyor', p. 36.
- 11 Charles Diehl, *Figures Byzantines*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed. (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1927).
- 12 C. E. Vaughan, 'Carlyle and His German Masters' in *Essays and Studies*, I (Oxford: OUP, 1910), pp. 168-96.
- 13 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 4.
- 14 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 4.
- 15 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 4.
- 16 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, 'Parisde Osmanlı Sefirleri', pp. 5-60.
- 17 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, pp. 19-60.
- 18 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 19.
- 19 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 19.
- 20 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 19.
- 21 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 20.
- 22 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 22.
- 23 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 23.
- 24 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 30.
- 25 L. Rey, *Le Petit Trianon et le hameau de Marie-Antoinette* (Paris: P. Vorms., 1936).
- 26 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, pp. 32-3.
- 27 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 33.
- 28 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 33.
- 29 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 35.
- 30 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 35.
- 31 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 37.
- 32 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 36-8.
- 33 Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, p. 38.
- 34 Cfr. chapter I/2, p. 38.
- 35 The piece dealing with Mehmed Said Efendi solely relates to his career under Mahmud I (1730-54). Ahmed Refik, *Simâlar*, pp. 41-60.
- 36 In 1913, Ahmed Refik had written an article on Kabakçı Mustafa published in *Şebhal* (V, 76, 15 May 1329/1913). Ahmed Refik, *Kabakçı Mustafa* (İstanbul: Kitabhâne-i Askeri, 1331/1915); *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 215, no. 297.

- 37 Ahmed Refik, *Kabakçı*, p. 3.
- 38 Ahmed Refik, *Kabakçı*, p. 5.
- 39 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 30-1, 35.
- 40 Ahmed Refik, 'Fatma Sultan' in *İkdam* (9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22 December 1916/1332); Ahmed Refik, *Fatma Sultan. Garyri Matbû Vesikalara Nazaran Yazılmışdır* (İstanbul: Diken ve İnci Matbaası, s.d.).
- 41 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 3.
- 42 This book first appeared in serialised form ('Felâket Seneleri 1094-1110' in *İkdam*, 6027 - 6064, (4 December 1913 - 13 January 1914), but was also published by İbrahim Hilmi in 1332/1916. The narrative recounts events from the appointment of Kara Mustafa Paşa to the conclusion of the Treaty of Karlowitz (1699). Against the background of the Great War, one cannot but wonder about the timely appearance of this title on the Ottoman book market. Ahmed Refik, *Felâket Seneleri (1094-1110)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Kitabhâne-i Askeri, 1332/1916-7), p. 3.
- 43 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 5.
- 44 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 11.
- 45 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 25.
- 46 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 25.
- 47 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 26.
- 48 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 29.
- 49 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 34.
- 50 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, pp. 35-7.
- 51 Basing himself on Dilâverzâde Ömer, Atâ declares that the Damad's social circle consisted of members of the *ulema* as well as followers of *tarikats*. Atâ adds that the Damad was so fond of their conversation that he spent most days and nights in their company. He also underlines Damad İbrahim's patronage of pious foundations (*evkâf*). He mentions that he founded a small mosque, including a classroom and an outstanding library, known as *darülbadis*. Atâ even claims that the Damad's posthumous reputation rested upon his many pious foundations spread throughout the capital and the country-side. *Tarib-i Atâ*, vol.II, p. 156, 158 and 159-65.
- 52 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 39.
- 53 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, pp. 42-3.
- 54 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp.12-4.
- 55 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 43.
- 56 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 38.
- 57 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 43.
- 58 A.Vandal, *Une ambassade*, p. 90.
- 59 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 44.
- 60 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 44.
- 61 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 60.
- 62 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 67.
- 63 Ahmed Refik, *Fatma*, p. 67.
- 64 Ahmed Refik, 'Onikinci Asr-ı Hicride İlk Osmanlı Matbaası (1-3)' in *İkdam*, 7218, 7236, 7250 (16 March 1333/1917, 3 April 1333/1917, 17 April 1333/1917).
- 65 Ahmed Refik, 'Matbaası (2)', p. 2.
- 66 In a footnote he even affirms that they had already in Paris decided to set up a printing press in İstanbul, referring to Saint-Simon's memoirs as a source. Ahmed Refik, 'Matbaası (2)', p. 2.
- 67 'Rusya Hâlâ İhtilâl Şarhoşluğu İçinde' in *İkdam*, 7236, (3 April 1333/1917), p. 2.

- 68 Ahmed Refik, *Memâlik-i Osmanîyyede Kırâl Râkôcî ve Tevâbii* (1109-1154) (İstanbul: Hilâl Matbaası, 1333/1917).
- 69 Fatma Aliye, 'Şiir ve Kadın' in *İkdam*, 7459 (17 November 1917). Quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 343, no.729.1.
- 70 M. Kızıltan, *Fatma Aliye Hanım. Yaşamı - Sanatı - Yapıtları ve Nisvan-ı İslam* (İstanbul: Mutlu Yayıncılık, 1993).
- 71 M. Kızıltan, 'Türk Kadın Hakları Mücadele Tarihinde Fatma Aliye Hanım'ın Yeri' in *Kuram-Kitap* (January 1993), pp. 83-93.
- 72 Fatma Aliye, 'Şiir ve Kadın'.
- 73 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp.13-4.
- 74 Cfr. Chapter I/1, p. 13.
- 75 But she might just as well have based herself on her father's account of the tulip trade in Damad İbrahim's *sadâret*.
- 76 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 42.
- 77 Ahmed Refik, 'Tarih Nazarında İbrahim Paşa (1-3)' in *İkdam*, 7468-70 (26-28 November 1917). Quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 344, no. 729.2.
- 78 *Şem'dânî-zâde Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi Târîhi Mür'î-i-Tevârih I*, ed. M. M. Aktepe (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1976).
- 79 Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 396; O. Ş. Gökyay, *Kâtip Çelebi. Yaşamı, Kişiliği ve Yapıtlarından Seçmeler* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası, 1982), p. 24; Kâtip Çelebi, *Takvim üt-Tevârih* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1146/1733).
- 80 Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 306.
- 81 There appear to be four copies of the manuscript available in İstanbul: one in the Beyazıt Devlet Kütüphanesi, one in the Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi, and two versions in the Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi. *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. XXXV; Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 306.
- 82 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 2.
- 83 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 3.
- 84 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 3.
- 85 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 3.
- 86 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 3.
- 87 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 3.
- 88 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 3.
- 89 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 3.
- 90 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 4.
- 91 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 4.
- 92 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 4.
- 93 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 5.
- 94 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 6.
- 95 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 6.
- 96 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol.VI, p.615.
- 97 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol.VI, pp.615-6.
- 98 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 6.
- 99 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 6.
- 100 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, pp. 6-7.
- 101 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 8.
- 102 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 8.
- 103 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 71.
- 104 *Şem'dânî-zâde*, p. 8.



- 105 Their tenures lasted from 1130/1718 till 1143/1730, adding up to 12 years according to the *milâdi* calendar and 13 years according to the *hicri* calendar.
- 106 *Şem'dâni-zâde*, p. 8.
- 107 *Şem'dâni-zâde*, p. 10.
- 108 The text appears to be corrupt, as the abdication took place on 19 *Rebiyülevvel*, corresponding to 2 October 1730. Münir Aktepe erroneously accepts the date given in Şemdanîzâde's manuscript.
- 109 *Şem'dâni-zâde*, p. 11.
- 110 *Şem'dâni-zâde*, p. XX.
- 111 Subhî's narrative was printed as part of the *Tarih-i Sâmî ü Şâkir ü Subhî* (1198/1784), and the *Tarih-i İzzî* was published the following year (1199/1785). T. H., 'Subhî, Subhî Mehmed Efendi' in *İA*, vol. X (1967), pp. 169-71; İ. Parmaksızoğlu, 'İzzî. İzzî, Sulayman Efendi in *İA*, vol. V/2, pp. 1267-9.
- 112 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 25, 49 and 52.
- 113 Cfr. Chapter I/1, p. 13.
- 114 Cfr. Chapter I/1, p. 13.
- 115 Ch. K. Neumann, *Amaç*, pp. 56, 75-7; *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. I, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (1309/1891-2), p. 6.
- 116 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 42.
- 117 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 42.
- 118 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 41-4.
- 119 Cfr. Chapter I/1, p. 13.
- 120 Fatma Aliye, 'Damad İbrahim Paşa Meselesi' in *İkdam*, 7483-84 (11-12 December 1917). Quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 345, no. 729.4-5.
- 121 Ahmed Refik, 'Damad İbrahim Paşa ve Aleyhdârları (1-6)' in *İkdam*, 7485, 7487, 7489, 7491-2, 7494 (13, 15, 17, 19-20, 22 December 1917).
- 122 Ahmed Refik, 'Aleyhdârları -1' in *İkdam*, 7485 (13 December 1917).
- 123 Ahmed Refik, 'Aleyhdârları -2' in *İkdam*, 7487 (15 December 1917).
- 124 Ahmed Refik, 'Aleyhdârları -3' in *İkdam*, 7489 (17 December 1917).
- 125 Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Tanzimât-ı Hayriyye: Tahli'l' in *Tarih Musâhabeleri* (İstanbul: Sabah Matbaası, 1339/1923), p. 43.
- 126 The articles were published in book form in the year the Republic was founded. Abdurrahman Şeref describes the regulations of the *Tanzimat* as a new style of government. He recounts how Mustafa Reşid Paşa had come to the conclusion that the Ottomans would not survive if they did not embark upon the 'new road of civilisation', abandoning the 'worn out methods' of the past. He concludes that the *Tanzimat* reforms had possessed the highest legal value according to their time and context. Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Tanzimât-ı Hayriyye: Tahli'l', *Tanzimât-ı Hayriyye: Tenkidi* in *Tarih Musâhabeleri*, pp. 3, 48, 60 and 63.
- 127 In the final instalments Ahmed Refik deals extensively with claims relating to Damad İbrahim's wealth. He engages in a serious amount of number-crunching to show that Josef von Hammer had adopted the mistaken figures given by Şemdanîzâde. He describes his own *Lâle Devri* as an impartial treatise containing evidence contrary to the prejudiced views on İbrahim Paşa's outrageous wealth. He denounces Ottoman historians such as Ahmed Cevdet as unpatriotic writers relying on information proffered by foreigners, such as Hammer. Furthermore, Ahmed Refik describes the tulip-related festivities organised by İbrahim Paşa as 'civilised' entertainments (poetry, music, literary conversations) attended by members of the Ottoman ruling class. In the end Ahmed Refik directly accuses Fatma Aliye of having written an unsound piece containing fallacious statements. Ahmed Refik, 'Damad

- İbrahim Paşa ve Aleyhdârları -4, 5, 6' in *İkdam*, 7491-2, 7494 (19-20 and 22 December 1917).
- 128 Fatma Aliye, 'Yine İbrahim Paşa Meselesi (1-2)' in *İkdam*, 7499-7500 (27-28 December 1917); Ahmed Refik, 'Damad İbrahim Paşa Hakkında' in *Yeni Mecmua*, 27 (10 January 1918). Quoted in *Tarihî Sevdiren*, p. 346, no.729-7-8.
- 129 Abdurrahman Şeref refers to these three statesmen as the 'Tanzimât triumvirate' in one of his articles published in *Sabah*. Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Erkân-ı Sel[a]se-i Tanzimâtın Mukâyesesi' in *Tarih Musahabeleri*, nr. 13, pp. 105-14.
- 130 Ahmed Refik, *Padişahlarımızda Din Gayreti ve Vatan Muhabbeti* (s. l., 1332/1916-17).
- 131 Eyal Ginio, 'Mobilizing the Ottoman Nation during the Balkan Wars (1912-1913): Awakening from the Ottoman Dream' in *War in History*, 12, 2 (April 2005), pp. 156-177.
- 132 Ahmed Refik, 'Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa Türkdü ve Müslümandı' in *İkdam*, 7477 (5 December 1333/1917), p. 1.
- 133 The poet Yahya Kemal published an article entitled 'Şahsî Hâtıralar' in *Türk Yurdu* (November 1924) in which he relates the birth of this 'nationalist' periodical, dominated by Ziya Gökalp. Yahya Kemal, 'Şahsî Hâtıralar' in *Türk Yurdu* (November 1924). Republished as 'Ziya Gökalp' in *Siyasî ve Edebi Portreler* (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1968), pp. 17-8.
- 134 Ahmed Refik published seven articles directly relating to the reign of Ahmed III in *Yeni Mecmua* during the period September 1917 - March 1918.
- 135 Ahmed Refik, 'Sultan Ahmed-i Sâlis Çeşmeleri' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 27 (10 January 1918), pp. 9-12.
- 136 Ahmed Refik, 'Çeşmeleri', p. 11.
- 137 In spite of providing these clear dates Goodwin still calls these buildings 'the climax and the end of the Tulip period'. Then he discloses that '[o]f the seven most grand, only two were built by Ahmed III [the one in front of the Imperial Gate and the one on the market square in Üsküdar]; the others belong to the reign of his successor Mahmut I'. G. Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971), p. 374.
- 138 Ahmed Refik, 'Çeşmeleri', p. 9.
- 139 Ahmed Refik, 'Sultan Ahmed-i Sâlis ve Damadı' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 34 (7 March 1918), p. 149.
- 140 Ahmed Refik, 've Damadı', p. 149.
- 141 Ahmed Refik, 've Damadı', p. 152.
- 142 Ahmed Refik, 'Pasarofça Müsalâhası Akd Edilirken ... Mart 1718 - Mart 1918' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 35 (14 March 1918), pp. 169-72.
- 143 Ahmed Refik, 'Pasarofça', p. 169.
- 144 G. A. Craig, 'The World War I Alliance of the Central Powers in Retrospect: The Military Cohesion of the Alliance' in *JMH*, 37, (1965), pp. 336-44; U. Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire, 1914-1918* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968); F. G. Weber, *Eagles on the Crescent: Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Turkish Alliance, 1914-1918* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970).
- 145 The adviser Liman von Sanders also points to the animosity between Enver and Cemal Paşas in his narrative. [Otto] Liman von Sanders, *Five Years in Turkey*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Anapolis, 1928), p. 33; S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 310.
- 146 Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda Ecnebi Ressamlar: Vânmûr, Hiler' in *Yeni Mecmua*, II, 40 (18 April 1918), pp. 269-72.
- 147 Chapter I/2, pp. 26 and 40.

- 148 Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda', p. 269.
- 149 Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda', p. 269.
- 150 *Lâle*, pp. 24-5.
- 151 In turn this phraseology was lifted from Râşid Mehmed's *Tarih*. The issue of Râşid's views on Yirmisekiz Çelebi will be dealt with at great length in the second part of the thesis. *Lâle*, p. 24. Cfr. Chapter II/1, pp. 105-6.
- 152 Ahmed Refik's wording in this instance resembles a French text written down in the late eighteenth century. V. Mignot, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris: Le Clerc, 1771), vol. IV, p. 252-3.
- 153 Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda', p. 269.
- 154 In the nineteenth century the opposition between the Latin West and the Byzantine East had been a theme oftentimes repeated by European scholars dealing with Byzantine culture, civilisation and religion. In particular the Byzantine role in the emergence of the Italian renaissance was a topic that received critical attention at the time. The Frenchman Henri Omont, for instance, devoted studies to the transmission of Greek manuscripts to Italy and on their supposed survival in the holdings of the Ottoman palace. H. Omont, 'Inventaire de manuscrits grecs et latins donnés à Saint-Marc de Venise (1468)' in *Revue des Bibliothèques*, IV (1894), pp. 129-87; H. Omont, 'Documents sur l'imprimerie à Constantinople au XVIIIe siècle' in *Revue des Bibliothèques*, V, (1895); J. Armingaud, *Venise et le Bas-Empire* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1868); D. J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West: The Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), pp. 112-93.
- 155 Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda', p. 269.
- 156 He used the term 'maarifet', which nowadays denotes skilfulness, but the noun 'maarif' in Ottoman denotes knowledge and culture as illustrated in the case of the Ottoman *Maarif Nezâret* and the republican *Maarif Vekâleti*, the Ministry of Education, responsible for a wide variety of cultural issues. Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda', p. 269.
- 157 Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda', p. 269.
- 158 Ahmed Refik, 'İstanbulda', p. 272.
- 159 Ziya Gökalp published his seminal text 'Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak' in *Türk Yurdu* in 1913. It was to appear in book form in 1918. According to Taha Parla, Gökalp uses 'interchangeably' the terms 'Westernism or modernism', which Parla defines as 'the scientific, technological, industrial achievements of European capitalism'. T. Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp 1876-1924* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), p. 26.
- 160 [M.Ziyâ] Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek -1' in *Türk Yurdu*, III, 11 (1329/1913), p. 331.
- 161 [M.Ziyâ] Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek -1', p. 332.
- 162 [M.Ziyâ] Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek -1', p. 332.
- 163 [M.Ziyâ] Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek -1', p. 332.
- 164 [M.Ziyâ] Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek -5' in *Türk Yurdu*, IV, 10 (1329/1913), p. 756.
- 165 [M.Ziyâ] Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek -5' p. 756.
- 166 [M.Ziyâ] Gökalp, 'Türkleşmek -5' p. 757.
- 167 *Lâle*, pp. 60-1 and 80.
- 168 *Lâle*, p. 150.
- 169 J. Burckhardt, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, 2 vols, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., (Leipzig: A. Kröner, 1885).
- 170 A. Buck, 'Einführung'; A. Buck, 'Burckhardt und die italienische Renaissance' in August Buck (ed.), *Renaissance und Renaissancismus von Jacob Burckhardt bis*

- Thomas Mann* (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1990), pp.2 and 5; P. Burke, 'Introduction' in J. Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, transl. S. G. C. Middlemore (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990), pp. 1-15.
- 171 Even though such thinkers as Arthur de Gobineau and Walter Pater are also seen as influential, Nietzsche's thinking was of primordial importance, as claimed by Luca Farulli. Nietzsche expressed these views in his later work, such as *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches* (1878), *die fröhliche Wissenschaft* (1882), *Zur Genealogie der Moral* (1887), *Der Antichrist* (1888) and *Ecce Homo* (1888). A. Buck, 'Burckhardt und die italienische Renaissance'; Luca Farulli, 'Nietzsche und die Renaissance: Die Reflexion über "Grenze" und "Grenzüberschreitung"' in August Buck (ed.), *Renaissance und Renaissancismus*, pp. 11 and 67-70; J. P. Stern, *A Study of Nietzsche* (Cambridge: CUP, 1979), pp. 139-70.
- 172 '671 Senelik Muazzam Osmanlı Devleti' in *İkdam*, nr.8220 (31 December 1335/1919), p. 1.
- 173 Ahmed Refik, 'Tarihde Hoca Nüfüzu (1-22)' in *İkdam*, 8155-81 (25 October - 21 November 1919). After the establishment of the Republic İbrahim Hilmi published this text as part of the series 'Genç Türk Kitaphanesi' under a slightly different title. I have based myself on the latter publication. Ahmed Refik, *Osmanlı Devrinde Hoca Nüfüzu* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1933).
- 174 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 3.
- 175 Ahmed Refik regarded the decline of the *ulema* as a result of their lack of moral rectitude that had led them to abandon the pursuit of scholarship, learning and the faith in favour of more material concerns. Even though he had singled out Murad III, Ahmed Refik saw the seventeenth century as the era to have seen the emergence of greedily and power-hungry *ulema*. He further claimed that the main concern of members of the *ulema* had been personal advantage and monetary gains. Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, pp. 4-5 and 8-9.
- 176 Ahmed Refik explained this as the result of the fact that the institution of the *medrese* had lost its former order and discipline in the second half of the seventeenth century. Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, pp. 95 and 97.
- 177 Ahmed Refik spoke of the deposition of Osman II by the janissaries, but remarked that members of the *ulema* had also participated in the uprising. This, he argued, set a precedent leading to a close cooperation between the *ulema* and the janissaries, opposing possible incursions on their respective privileges. Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 11-3, 106.
- 178 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 106.
- 179 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 106.
- 180 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 107.
- 181 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, pp. 108-9, 115.
- 182 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 115.
- 183 Madeline C. Zilfi, 'The Kadızadeli: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul' in *JNES*, 45, 4 (October 1986), pp. 251-69.
- 184 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 115.
- 185 The idea that scientific courses in *medrese* curricula would constitute a solution to the problem of ill-equipped *ulema* had already in September 1914/1330 led to the promulgation of a reform programme, the Islâh-ı Medâris. Cfr. Chapter 1/2, p. 45.
- 186 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 119.
- 187 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, pp. 119-20.
- 188 Cfr. Chapter 1/2, pp. 56-7.
- 189 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 120.

- 190 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 121.
- 191 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, pp. 125-8.
- 192 Ahmed Refik, *Hoca*, p. 128.
- 193 Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın], 'Lâle Devrinde Saadabad Akşamları' in *Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın'dan Seçmeler*, ed. Necat Birinci (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1982), pp. 38-44.
- 194 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp.10-1. Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın], 'Saadabad', p. 39.
- 195 Ruşen Eşref, 'Saadabad', p. 40.
- 196 Ruşen Eşref, 'Saadabad', pp. 41-3.
- 197 Cfr. Chapter I/2.
- 198 *Dr. Rifat Osman: Edirne Sarayı*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., ed. A. Süheyl Ünver (Ankara: TTK, 1989), p. 31.

Chapter II/1  
The Establishment of  
the Turkish Republic and  
the Quest for a New Historiography, 1923-30

1. Burhan Belge, 'La Mission du Kamâlısme' in *La Turquie Kemaliste*, 20 (1937), p. 1.
- 1 In 1919 leading members of the group approached Mustafa Kemal to head the resistance movement, as his reputation was untainted. Kemalist indoctrination and re-evaluation of Turkish history have ensured that the important role played by the Unionist movement in setting up a resistance movement has been largely ignored. Recently however, the Turkish scholar Emel Akal published her in-depth study of the origins of the 'National Struggle', which supports the view that the Unionists played an important part in organising 'Turkish' resistance. E. J. Zürcher, *The Unionist Factor. 1905-1926* (Leiden: Brill, 1984), pp. 68-105; E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey. A Modern History* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1993), pp. 141 and 147; Emel Akal, *Millî Mücadele'nin Başlangıcında Mustafa Kemal, İttihat Terakki ve Bolşevizm* (İstanbul: Tüstav, 2002).
- 2 Halide Edib [Adivar], *The Turkish Ordeal* (New York and London: J. Murray, 1928), p. 20.
- 3 Cfr. Michel Paillarès, *Le Kémalisme devant les alliés* (Constantinople and Paris: Éditions du Bosphore, 1922).
- 4 A. J. Toynbee and K. P. Kirkwood, *Turkey* (New York: Scribner, 1927), p. 88.
- 5 A. M. Şamsutdinov, *Mondros'tan Lozanda Türkiye Ulusal Kurtuluş Savaşı Tarihi 1918-1923*, translator A. Behramoğlu (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 1999), pp. 282-97.
- 6 C. Coçak, 'Siyasal Tarih (1923-1950)' in S. Akşin, *Türkiye*, vol. IV, p. 87.
- 7 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 56.
- 8 Ahmed Refik, 'Hilâfet Meselesi ve Yeni Türkiye' in *İkdam*, no. 9210 (7 November 1338/1922), p. 3.
- 9 Suna Kili, *Kemalism* (İstanbul School of Business Administration and Economics, Robert College, 1969); *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmî Kaynakları, vol.3, Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Ok'u*, ed. Taha Parla, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1992).
- 10 Paul C. Helmreich, *From Paris to Sévres. The Partition of the Ottoman Empire* (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1974); E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey*, pp. 153-8 and 166-70.
- 11 E. J. Zürcher, 'The Rise and Fall of "modern" Turkey' (1998). Cfr. <http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/Lewis.htm>
- 12 E. J. Zürcher, 'The Ottoman Legacy of the Turkish Republic: An Attempt at a New Periodization' in *DWDI*, new series, 32, 2 (1992), p. 238.
- 13 Jäschke matter-of-factly speaks of the 'Jungtürkenprozess', which started on 1 August. E. J. Zürcher, 'The Ottoman', p. 238; G. Jäschke, 'Die Türkei seit dem Weltkrieg. Geschichtskalender 1918 - 1929' in *DWDI*, 10 (1927-29), p. 106.
- 14 Mustafa Kemal gave a number of interviews to the newspapers *Vakit* (January 1922) and *Milliyet* (March 1926) which contained his re-interpretive approach to recounting the struggle for independence. In 1927, he held his 'gigantic six-day speech' in the TBMM, the *Nutuk*, which finalised the Kemalist version of the Turkish Republic's history, which 'assumed the status of absolute truth'. Hasan Âli Yücel's essay 'Kitabımız' (1937) seems to have finalised the sacrosanct status of the *Nutuk*. In it Yücel states that every 'social belief-system' possesses a 'book', which the

- adherents of said system regard as 'sacred' ('kutsal'). He simply describes Mustafa Kemal's published speech as the Kemalists' 'sacred book' (bizim kutsal kitabımız olan Nutuk'). E. J. Zürcher, 'The Ottoman', p. 239; H. Â. Yücel, 'Kitabımız' in *Pazartesi Konuşmaları* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1937), pp. 1-4.
- 15 E. J. Zürcher, 'Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları' in Tanıl Bora (ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001), vol. 2, pp. 44-55.
- 16 Turkey's present Ministry of Education (*Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı* or *MEB*) on its website claims such a continuity. The ministry was formally organised a decade later with the promulgation of Law no. 2287 on 22 June 1933: *Maarif Vekâleti Merkez Teşkilâtı ve Vazifeleri hakkında Kanun*. <http://www.meb.gov.tr/>.
- 17 The book's outside cover bears the inscription '1926', whereas the inside cover carries '1924' as its date of publication. But in view of the fact that the final pages of the book deal with events after 1924, the book must have been released in '1926'. Nedim Yalansız mentions that the book was published in 1924. Büşra Ersanlı Behar states that the textbook had seen three reprints in the period 1924-29. Ahmed Hâmid and Mustafa Muhsin, *Kur'un-ı Cedidde ve Asr-ı Hâzırda Türkiye Tarihi. İstanbulun Fethinden Zamanımıza Kadar*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Maarif Vekâleti, 1926) (hereafter abridged to Hâmid and Muhsin); B. Ersanlı Behar, *İktidar ve Tarih. Türkiye'de "Resmî Tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu (1929-1937)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Afa Yayınları, 1996), pp. 99-100; Nedim Yalansız, 'Cumhuriyet Dönemi Osmanlı Tarihi Çalışmaları (1923-1960)', in *TT*, 14, 82 (October 2000), p. 12.
- 18 The textbook bears the inscription 'Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Maarif Vekâleti Neşriyatından'.
- 19 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 109.
- 20 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 129.
- 21 Cfr. chapter I/3, p. 78.
- 22 The authors devote only one other separate chapter to an individual vezir, namely Sokollu Mehmed Paşa. Hâmid and Muhsin, pp. 109-26 ('Sököllu Zamanı'); 276-82 ('Damad İbrahim Paşa, Şahsiyeti ve İdâresi, Siyaseti').
- 23 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 276.
- 24 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 276.
- 25 Hâmid and Muhsin, pp. 276-7.
- 26 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 277.
- 27 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp. 12-4.
- 28 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 278.
- 29 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 278.
- 30 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 39.
- 31 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 280.
- 32 Hâmid and Muhsin, pp. 280-1.
- 33 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 282.
- 34 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 282.
- 35 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 282.
- 36 Ahmed Refik published a document relating to the establishment of this paper factory at Yalova dated 'evaili ra 1159', corresponding to the period 23 April - 2 May 1746, thus firmly placing the event in the reign of Mahmud I (1730-54). Ahmed Refik, *Hicri On İkinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1000-1100)* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931), no. 196, pp. 164-5. Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 282
- 37 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 282; cfr. Chapters I/2, pp. 30-1, 35 and 48; I/3, p. 59.
- 38 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 283.
- 39 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 287.

- 40 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 287.
- 41 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 287.
- 42 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 287. Cfr. Chapter I/1, p. 12.
- 43 Hâmid and Muhsin, pp. 558 and 652.
- 44 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 667.
- 45 E. J. Zürcher, 'The Ottoman', p. 239.
- 46 The Republic was legally established by means of the proclamation of a constitution (*Teşkilâtı Esasiye Kanunu*, Kanun No: 491, 20 April 1924/1340, consisting of six sections and 105 articles). İ. F. Akın, *Türk Devrimi Tarihi*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın, 1992), pp. 190-3; E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey*, p. 77; <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/anayasa/main.htm>
- 47 In the following year Ahmed Refik published an article in the daily *İkdam*, proclaiming *medreses* to have been centres of ignorance. Ahmed Refik, 'Onikinci Asırda Medreseler' in *İkdam*, no. 10228 (27 September 1341/1925), p. 3.
- 48 Prior to the closure, Ahmed Refik used his columns in *İkdam* to endorse the government. He wrote that *tekkes* and *tarikats* had been able to gather popular support in the course of history, but that these institutions had in fact been nothing but tools to sway the people in accordance to certain reactionary political opinions. Ahmed Refik, 'Tarihimizde Tekkeler ve Şeyhler' in *İkdam*, no. 10219 (18 September 1341/1925), p. 3.
- 49 Hâmid and Muhsin, p. 667.
- 50 Ali Canib [Yöntem], 'Teceddüdperver Vezirlerden: İbrahim Paşa' in *Hayat*, I, 5 (30 December 1926), pp. 9-13/89-93 (hereafter abridged to 'Teceddüdperver').
- 51 'Teceddüdperver', p.9/89.
- 52 'Teceddüdperver', p.11/91.
- 53 Cfr. Chapter I/3, pp. 68, 72-3.
- 54 'Teceddüdperver', pp. 11-2/91-2.
- 55 'Teceddüdperver', p. 12/92.
- 56 'Teceddüdperver', p. 12/92.
- 57 'Teceddüdperver', p. 12/92.
- 58 Cfr. Chapters I/2, pp. 45, 50, 56-7; I/3, pp. 79-82.
- 59 'Teceddüdperver', p. 12/92.
- 60 Cfr. Chapter I/3, pp. 73, 76-7 and 79.
- 61 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 54-5.
- 62 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 82.
- 63 İSTANBUL, 'Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın' in *DBİA*, vol. 7 (1994), p. 342.
- 64 Refik Ahmed [Sevengil], *İstanbul Nasıl Eğleniyordu? Fetihden Zamanımıza Kadar* (İstanbul: Sühulet Kitabhanesi, 1927).
- 65 Refik Ahmed, 'Üçüncü Ahmed Zamanında Yapdırılan Köşkler', pp. 109-14.
- 66 Refik Ahmed, 'Saadabad Âlemlerinde Neşe ve Cüş', pp. 130-4.
- 67 Refik Ahmed, 'Kışın Helvâ sohbetlerinde Neler Olurdu?', pp. 120-4; 'Çırağan Se-fası Nedir, Nasıl Yapılır?', pp. 139-43.
- 68 Refik Ahmed, 'Lâle Devrinde Kadınların Kıyâfet ve Zarâfeti', pp. 135-8.
- 69 Ahmed Refik employed his position at the daily *İkdam* to publish his views on the issue of the further existence of the *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni*. *From Court*, p. 44.
- 70 Hamit Bozarslan even states that the so-called Sheikh Said rebellion, which he describes as the 'second in a series of [Kurdish] uprisings', 'shook the very foundations of Kemalist power'. Hamit Bozarslan, 'Kurdish Nationalism in Turkey: From Tacit Contract to Rebellion (1919-1925)' in Abbas Vali, *Essays on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism* (Costa Mesa, Ca: Mazda Publishers, 2003), p.164.



- 71 Maarten van Bruinessen, *Agha, Shaikh and State: On the Social and Political Organization of Kurdistan* (London: Zed Books, 1992), pp. 298-9.
- 72 The new law remained in place till 4 March 1929. This meant that Turkey was effectively governed by an emergency legislation during four years. E.-J. Zürcher, 'From Empire to Republic – Problems of Transition, Continuity and Change'. [www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/Fromtorep.htm](http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/Fromtorep.htm); Robert W. Olson and W. F. Tucker, 'The Sheikh Sait Rebellion in Turkey (1925)' in *DWDI*, 18, 3/4 (1978), p. 203.
- 73 Kemal Karpat correctly describes the promulgation of the Law of the Maintenance of Order 'the beginning of a new phase in the history of the [Turkish] republic'. Kemal H. Karpat, *Turkey's Politics* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1959), p. 48.
- 74 She says that the 'Law of Maintenance of Order [re-established] Revolutionary tribunals, with absolute power to arrest and execute anyone suspected of endangering the public order'. Halide Edib, *Turkey Faces West*, pp. 220 and 258.
- 75 Bülent Çukurova, 'Tarikat-ı Salahiye Cemiyeti, Ankara İstiklal Mahkemesince Mahkum Edilmesi ve Sonrası' in *TiT*, XIII, 17 (1990), pp. 40-6.
- 76 The document, numbered ATASE, kl. 1677, D. 411, F. 2-9, 2-21, is held in the archives of the Presidency of Military History and Strategic Studies of the [Turkish] General Staff in Ankara. Reproduced in Hülya Küçük, *The Role of the Bektashi in Turkey's National Struggle* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002), p. 364.
- 77 'Üç Tevkif' in *Cumhuriyet* (8 July 1925); 'Tarikat-ı Salâhiye Mensublarından Ahmed Refik Beyin ve Feyzullahin İsticvâbi' in *Cumhuriyet* (12-3 July 1925). Quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 126;
- 78 The daily *Açıksöz* reported Ahmed Refik's words between 9 and 12 July 1925. Quoted in Hülya Küçük, *Bektashi*, pp. 202-3 and 206.
- 79 The controversial journalist Lütfi Fikri, who had been at odds with the Unionist government in previous years, published an 'open letter' to the Caliph in the daily *Tanin* ('Huzur-ı Hazret-i Hilâfetpenâhiye Açık Arıza', 10 November 1923) in which he argued in favour of a continued strong Ottoman presence in Turkish public life and reasoned for continued political leverage of the Ottoman Caliph. A. A. Gazel, 'İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Bir Sivil İtaatsizlik Örneği: Lütfi Fikri Bey'in Tanzimat Gazetesi, in *AAD*, 24 (2005), pp. 127-38.
- 80 G. Jäschke, 'Die Türkei, p. 96; *Cumhuriyet* (16 August 1925). Quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 126; Hülya Küçük, *Bektashi*, p. 204.
- 81 'Türk Tarihi Encümeni hakkındaki tâlimatnâmenin meriyyete vazine dâir kararname' in *Düstür*, no. 446 (3 July 1927), III, 8, pp. 2025-8; *From Court*, p. 45.
- 82 'Tarih Encümeni Yeni Bir Tarzda Teşkil Ediliyor' in *Cumhuriyet* (8 July 1927/8 Muharrem 1345) no. 1135, p. 3.
- 83 'Tarih Encümeni Yeni Bir Tarzda Teşkil Ediliyor', p. 3.
- 84 'Tarih Enstitüsü Dün İlk İçtimâini Akd Etdi' in *Cumhuriyet*, no. 1212 (23 September 1927/26 Rebiyülevvel 1346), p. 1.
- 85 'Tarih Encümeni Reisi Ahmed Refik Bey İstifâ Etdi' in *Cumhuriyet*, no. 1219 (30 September 1927/3 Rebiyülâhîr 1219), p. 1.
- 86 'Tarih Encümeni Reisi', p. 1.
- 87 Halil İncalık, 'Türk İlmî ve M. Fuad Köprülü' in *Türk Kültürü*, VI, 65 (March 1968), pp. 289-94; Halil Berktaş, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü* (İstanbul: Kaynak yayınları, 1983); E. Ülgen, 'Mehmed Fuad Köprülü' in *Tarih ve Medeniyet*, V, 52 (July 1998), pp. 60-4.
- 88 Cfr. Halil Berktaş, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi*.

- 89 *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists Oxford 1928* (London: OUP, 1929), pp. 83-6.
- 90 Cfr. chapter I/1, pp. 10-1.
- 91 Avram Galanti, 'Türkiyede İlk Katolik Kapûsin Manastırları' in *TTEM*, XIV, 2 (79) (March 1340/1924), pp. 125-8.
- 92 Abdurrahman Şeref, 'Sultan Abdülazizin Vefatı - İntihârımı, Katlımı?' in *TTEM*, XIV, 6 (83) (October 1340/1924), pp. 321-30.
- 93 Ahmed Refik, 'Tevârih-i Âli Osman' in *TTEM*, XVI, 14 (91) (March 1926), pp. 69-78.
- 94 Ahmed Refik, 'Damad İbrahim Paşa Zamanında Ürgüç ve Nevşehir' in *TTEM*, XIV, 3 (80) (May 1340/1924), pp. 156-185.
- 95 Büşra Behar correctly maintains that books such as this study of the Turks were written from a European point of view, and thus perpetuated orientalist and Eurocentrist stereotypes and prejudices. Necib Asım [Yazıksız], *Türk Tarihi* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1927). B. Eranlı Behar, *İktidar*, p. 56.
- 96 Necib Asım openly referred, and even admitted his indebtedness to the Frenchman Léon Cahun in the work's preface. Necib Asım, *Türk*, page elif.
- 97 Necib Asım, *Türk*, pp. elif, 9-30, 31-132, 134-551.
- 98 Stanley Lane-Poole, *The Mohammedan Dynasties. Chronological and Genealogical Tables with Historical Introductions* (Westminster: Constable, 1893). Halil Edhem [Eldem], *Düvel-i İslâmiyye. Tarihi Medhaller ile Taktimî ve Ensâbi Cedvelleri Muhtevîdir* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1345/1927).
- 99 Halil Edhem, *Düvel*, no. 131, pp. 320-30.
- 100 Halil Edhem, *Düvel*, no. 132, pp. 331-5.
- 101 Even though the issue of history education and historiography has recently been the focus of a surge of interest in Turkey, the school-books of the 1920s have not received sufficient critical treatment. B. Eranlı Behar, *İktidar*, pp.87-118; Ş. Özil & N. Tapan (eds), *Türkiye'nin Ders Kitapları. Orta Öğretim Ders Kitaplarına Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım* (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1991); S. Özbaran, *Tarih ve Öğretim* (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1992); Y. Kabapınar, 'Lise Tarih Kitapları' in *TvT*, XVIII, 106 (October 1992), pp. 36-40, 107 (November 1992), pp. 28-31, 108 (December 1992), pp. 39-44; S. Özbaran (ed.), *Tarih Öğretimi ve Ders Kitapları. 1994 BUCA Sempozyumu 29 Eylül-1 Ekim 1994* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1995); E. Copeaux, *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk-İslam Sentezine* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998).
- 102 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih. Tarih-i Kadim-Kurûn-ı Vustâ* (İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası, 1926).
- 103 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih* (1926), pp.5-106.
- 104 Ahmed Refik, *Büyük Tarih-i Umûmî* (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Orhaniye, 1328/1912), vol.I, pp.329-36 ('Hitler').
- 105 Ahmed Refik uses the names 'Asya-ı Sagrâ' and 'Anadolu' interchangeably throughout the section. Ahmed Refik, *Büyük Tarih-i Umûmî*, vol.I, p.329.
- 106 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih* (1926), p.70.
- 107 Mete Tunçay, however, makes references to this text as having been instrumental in formulating the Republic's History Thesis of 1932, employing the term 'müjdecî'. Halil Berktaş refers to the book in his study on Köprülü, but surprisingly Büşra Behar seems not to have picked up on Tunçay's suggestion in her study of the Turkish History Thesis. M. Tunçay, *Türk Cumhuriyetinin Tek Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması (1923-1931)* (Ankara: Cem, 1981), p.300; H. Berktaş, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi*, p. 50; B. Eranlı Behar, *İktidar*; Yusuf Gedikli (ed.), *Pontus Meselesi. Arap al-*

- fabesinden aktarılan, notlu ve tenkitli şekilde* (İstanbul: Bilge Karınca Yayınları, 2002).
- 108 As a matter of fact, already in 1902 the Norwegian scholar Jørgen Knudtzon announced the discovery of an Indo-Germanic language. Hrozny's linguistic studies confirmed Knudtzon's earlier claims. On 24 November 1915 he publicly announced the translation of the oldest known Indo-Germanic language, the Hittite language. J. G. Macqueen, *The Hittites*, paperback edition (London: Thames & Hudson, 1996), p. 22; Jørgen A. Knudtzon, *Die zwei Arzawa Briefe: die ältesten Urkunden in Indo-Germanischer Sprache* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902); F. Hrozny, 'Die Lösung des Hethitischen Problems' in *MDOG*, 56, (1915) pp. 17-50.
- 109 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih* (1926), p.70.
- 110 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih* (1926), pp.609-25.
- 111 In his earlier textbook (1327/1911-2), Ahmed Refik declares 'Osmanlıların ceddi Türklerdir' ['the Ottomans' forefathers are the Turks']. Ahmed Refik, *Küçük*, p. 3.
- 112 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih* (1926), p.609-24.
- 113 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih. Kurûn-ı Kadim, Garb Kurûn-ı Vustâsî* (İstanbul: Kitabhane-i Hilmi, 1928).
- 114 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp. 16-7.
- 115 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 169.
- 116 *Türk Sanatı*, pp. 23-56, 57-92 and 93-221.
- 117 *Türk Sanatı*, pp. 169-70 ('Lâle Devri').
- 118 *Türk Sanatı*, pp. 158-68.
- 119 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 169.
- 120 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 169.
- 121 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp. 16-7.
- 122 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 170.
- 123 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 170.
- 124 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 170.
- 125 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 170, 171.
- 126 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 170.
- 127 Cfr. Chapter I/3, pp. 64-5.
- 128 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 171.
- 129 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 170.
- 130 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 170.
- 131 *Türk Sanatı*, p. 171.
- 132 The principle of secularism had been included in the Constitution on 10 April 1928, with the removal of the phrase 'Türkiye Devletinin dini, Din-i İslâmdır' from its second article. The introduction the *Türk Medeni Kanunu* on 17 February 1926 had already prepared the population for such a radical break with tradition. İ. F. Akın, *Türk Devrimi*, p. 192; M. Katoğlu, 'Cumhuriyet Türkiyesinde Eğitim, Kültür, Sanat' in S. Akşin, *Türkiye*, vol. IV, pp. 393-7; *Türk Medeni Kanunu*, ed. E.Şener, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Ankara: Seçkin, 1998); B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, pp. 270-4; G. L. Lewis, *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success* (Oxford: OUP, 1999).
- 133 M. Katoğlu, 'Cumhuriyet', p. 395.
- 134 N. Berkes, *The Development*, pp. 486-87.
- 135 As if to underline this resolve, a few years later first the Topkapı Palace (1933) and then the Ayasofya Mosque were opened to the public as museums. H. Ethem [Eldem], *Topkapı Sarayı* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1931); Semavi Eyice, *Ayasofya* (İstanbul: Yapı ve Kredi Bankası, 1984); M. Katoğlu, 'Cumhuriyet', p. 396.

- 136 Z. Korkmaz, *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türk Dili* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 1974), p. 51
- 137 The groundwork for this bold move was executed by a Language Committee, established on 23 May 1928. Z. Korkmaz, *Cumhuriyet*, pp. 55-7; M. Katoglu, 'Cumhuriyet', p. 395.
- 138 Z. Korkmaz, *Cumhuriyet*, p. 58; Tekin Alp, *Le Kemalisme* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1937), pp. 91-7
- 139 The exemplary position of Arabic, as the language used by God to instruct the Prophet Mohammed, distinguishes the Muslim character of this tongue. Persian, on the other hand, enjoyed wide usage across the world of Islam as the primary expressive vehicle for poetry and literary culture.
- 140 E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey*, p. 189.
- 141 Chickering uses the phrase in connection with Wilhelmine Germany (1890-1914), seem to be equally applicable to Kemalist Turkey. Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and the Great War, 1914 - 1918* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), p. 2.
- 142 M. Katoglu, 'Cumhuriyet', p. 395.
- 143 Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek], *Türk Matbaacılığı. İkiyüzcüncü Sene-i Devriyyesi Münâsebetiyle* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ebüzziya, 1928) (hereafter abridged to *Matbaacılığı*).
- 144 H. Z. Şahin, 'Gerçek, Selim Nüzhet' in *DBLA* (1994), vol. 3, p. 394; A. Birinci, 'Selim Nüzhet Gerçek' in Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *İstanbul'dan Ben de Geçtim*, ed. A. Birinci and İ. Kara (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1997), pp. 13-28.
- 145 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 1.
- 146 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 2. Such a claim was exhaustively researched and defended in E. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change. Communication and Cultural Transformations in early-modern Europe*, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1979).
- 147 *Matbaacılığı*, pp. 2-3.
- 148 *Matbaacılığı*, pp. 5-26.
- 149 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 26.
- 150 *Matbaacılığı*, pp. 26 and 28.
- 151 *Matbaacılığı*, pp. 26-9.
- 152 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 30.
- 153 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 30.
- 154 On Yahya Kemal see chapter I/1, pp. 9-11, 14-6 and 19-20 and *supra*. But in keeping with the nationalist mood of the time, Selim Nüzhet immediately remarks further that this Persian taste (which he calls 'acem-peresti') had been Turkified. *Matbaacılığı*, p. 30.
- 155 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 32.
- 156 The eminent Orientalist Bernard Lewis allotted a great deal of importance to this passage in his classic study of the development of Turkish history. Lewis states that '[t]he statesman, chiefly responsible for the first attempt at reform was Damad İbrahim Paşa, who had 'in 1721 sent Yirmisekiz Mehmed Said Efendi [*sic*] as ambassador to Paris, with instructions to "make a thorough study of the means of civilization and education, and report on those capable of application" in Turkey'. He quoted Damad İbrahim's supposed words from Enver Ziya Karal's contribution to the commemorative *Tanzimat* volume, published 1940. This source will be dealt with at length in chapter II/3. Basing himself upon Karal's quotation of Selim Nüzhet's words, Bernard Lewis continues that '[t]hese exchanges with Europe began to produce, for the first time, some slight impact on cultural and social life'. Selim Nüzhet's cautious appraisal of the rather limited influx of European technology in the form of the printing press in İstanbul led Bernard Lewis to proclaim that the

- French 'wave of *Turquerie* . . . had its counterpart in a rather small wave of French manners and styles in Istanbul. French gardens, French decorations, French furniture acquired a brief vogue in [Ottoman] palace circles.' A couple of years later (1964) the Turkish scholar Niyazi Berkes published even more far-reaching and absolute statements relating to the printing press and the *sadâret* of Damad İbrahim. Berkes posits that '[i]nterest in Western civilization began to evince itself from the second decade of the eighteenth century among the educated classes'; a pronouncement which Berkes follows up with the claim that Yirmisekiz Çelebi 'was instructed by the Sadrazam İbrahim Paşa to "visit the fortresses, factories, and the works of French civilization generally and report on those which might be applicable [in Turkey]". The reference supplied reads 'Ali Suavi's edition (London, 1872) of the *Sefaretnâme* by Çelebi Mehmed, written in 1720'. The remainder of the footnote then is spent on a discussion of the duration of a trip from İstanbul to various destinations in Western Europe, a topic raised by Ali Suavi in his French preface to Mehmed Efendi's book. On the following page Berkes mentions Selim Nüzhet's *Türk Matbaacılığı*. Two decades later Lewis revisited the issue of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's trip. At that stage he included Berkes' addition of 'visit fortresses and factories'. And the reference reads 'Kara, *Tanzimat*, p. 19; Berkes, *Secularism*, p. 33'. B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, pp. 45-6; N. Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, new ed. (London: C. Hurst, 1998), p. 33, footnote 15; B. Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (London: Phoenix, 1982), pp. 240 and 329.
- 157 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 32, footnote [2].
- 158 B. Kütükoğlu, 'Vekâyinüvis' in *İA*, p. 276.
- 159 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. V, pp. 213-4 ('İrsâl-i Elçi-i Cânib-i Fırânce').
- 160 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. V, p. 213.
- 161 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. V, pp. 213-4.
- 162 B. Akyavaş, 'Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi ve Sefâretnâmesi' in *Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi'nin Fransa Sefâretnâmesi* (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1993), p. V.
- 163 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. V, pp. 330-67.
- 164 S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 130.
- 165 Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought. A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*, new ed. (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000), p. 360.
- 166 Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis*, pp. 361-4.
- 167 *Tacryr ou relation de Mohammed Effendi Ambassadeur par la S. Porte en France 1720*, ed. Suavi Effendi (Paris: V. Goupy, 1872).
- 168 *Tacryr*, p. 1.
- 169 The pages quoted are Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, pp. 29, 110 and 195. *Tacryr*, pp. 1-2.
- 170 *Tacryr*, p. 1.
- 171 *Tacryr*, p. 1.
- 172 *Tacryr*, p. 1.
- 173 F. M. Göçek, *East encounters West*, pp. 9, 64-7; G. R. Berridge, 'Diplomatic integration with Europe before Selim III' in A. Nuri Yurdusev (ed.), *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 114-30.
- 174 F. M. Göçek, *East Encounters West*, p. 86.
- 175 F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri ve Sefâretnâmeleri*, ed. B. S. Baykal (Ankara: TTK, 1968), pp. 4-5, 43 and 47-9; E. Kuran, *Avrupa'da Osmanlı İkamet Elçiliklerinin Kuruluşu ve İlk Elçilerin Siyasî Faaliyetleri* (Ankara: Ayıldız Matbaası, 1988), pp. 15-22.
- 176 F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, pp. 53-8.

- 177 Unat mentions that this edition was published in 1872 and contains 48 pages. F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, p. 58.
- 178 This edition of Yirmisekiz Çelebi's text contained 151 pages. F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, p. 58.
- 179 F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, p. 58.
- 180 This edition carries the title *Sefâretnâme-i Firânçe* (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı İlmiyye-i Osmaniyye, 1283/1866) and contains 83 pages. F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, p. 58.
- 181 This translation is entitled *Rélation de l'ambassade de Mehémet Effendy à la cour de France en 1721, écrite par lui-même et traduit du turc* (Paris, 1757). F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, p. 58.
- 182 F. M. Göcek, *East encounters West*, p. 139.
- 183 Unat pronounces that Damad İbrahim had embarked upon a 'programme of reforms' following the conclusion of the Passarowitz agreement. He claims that the Grand Vezir had been greatly inspired by Yirmisekiz Çelebi's journey. With regard to Mehmed Efendi's mission, however, he appears a lot more reserved, saying that the ambassador had 'seemingly' received a special non-political fact-finding mandate. In her book on Yirmisekiz Çelebi, Fatma Müge Göçek, however, claims that '[t]he actual aim of the embassy, however, was different; it was "to visit fortresses and factories, and to make a thorough study of means of civilization and education, and report on those suitable for application in the Ottoman Empire"'. Her reference simply reads: 'Berkes, *Development*, p. 33; Lewis, *Emergence*, pp. 45-46; Lewis, *Muslim Discovery*, p. 240'. At a later stage in her text she makes a second reference to these instructions. The reference for this second mention interestingly reads '[t]he original quotation is in *Tarih-i Raşid*. The quotation is cited by Berkes, *The Development of Secularism*, p. 33; Lewis, *Emergence*, pp. 45-6; Lewis, *Muslim Discovery*, p.240'. In spite of this bold claim she does not supply a full reference to Raşid, and neither do Lewis or Berkes, who in fact do not mention the *Tarih-i Râşid* at all in this connection. The *Tarih-i Râşid* does not mention Damad İbrahim's 'instructions'. F. R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, p. 54 and 56; F. M. Göcek, *East encounters West*, pp. 4, 87, 147 and 160.
- 184 Cfr. Chapters I/2, p. 54 and I/3, pp. 60-2, 64, 66, and 76.
- 185 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 62.
- 186 Selim Nüzhet makes an explicit reference to Karacsón's article when dealing with Müteferrika İbrahim (*Matbaacılığı*, p. 35). Cfr. chapter I/2, p. 54.
- 187 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 62.
- 188 İhsan Işık, *Yazarlar Sözlüğü* (İstanbul: Risale Yayınları, s.d.), p. 650; S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 489.
- 189 Cfr. chapter I/3, pp. 74-9.
- 190 Cfr. chapter I/2, p. 54.
- 191 Necip Asım, 'Türk Matbaacılığı' in *TTEM*, new series I, 2, (September-October 1929) (İstanbul, 1930), pp. 46-8.
- 192 Necip Asım, 'Türk Matbaacılığı', p. 46.
- 193 Cfr. O. Ş. Gökyay, *Kâtip Çelebi. Yaşamı, Kişiliği ve Yapıtlarından Seçmeler* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası, 1982).
- 194 Necip Asım, 'Türk Matbaacılığı', p. 46.
- 195 Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara Tarih Bilgisi. Kurunu vusta, Kurunu cedide* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitabhanesi, 1929).
- 196 Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara*, p. 7.
- 197 Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara*, p. 8.
- 198 Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara*, pp. 61-152.

- 199 Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara*, p. 85.  
200 Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara*, p. 156.  
201 Ahmed Refik, *İlk Türk Matbaası* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1929).  
202 Ahmed Refik, *İlk Türk*, pp. 1-3.  
203 In fact Gutenberg developed and perfected the procedure between 1450 and 1455, when he completed the so-called 42-line 'Gutenberg-Bibel'. Ahmed Refik, *İlk Türk*, p. 1.  
204 Ahmed Refik, *İlk Türk*, p. 16.  
205 Ahmed Refik, *İlk Türk*, p. 16.  
206 Ahmed Refik, *İlk Türk*, p. 22.

## Chapter II/2:

## The Subterranean Survival of the 'Tulip Age', 1930-38

- H. Cemil [Çambel], 'Hars Tebdili' in *Yeni Rub*, (1929), pp. 96-102. Re-published in *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı II Atatürk Dizisi: 11*, eds M. Kaplan et al., (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1981), pp. 6-7.
- 1 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 89.
- 2 Ali Canib [Yöntem], 'Rönesans ve Türkiye' in *Hayat*, I, 1-2 (December 1926), pp. 5-7.
- 3 This phrase could have been lifted from Nietzsche's work *Der Antichrist. Fluch auf das Christentum*, even though Ali Canib appears not to have been aware of the German philosopher's sentiments. Ali Canib, 'Rönesans ve Türkiye', p. 6; Luca Farulli, 'Nietzsche', p. 69.
- 4 Ali Canib, 'Rönesans', p. 6.
- 5 M. Ş. İpşir[oğlu], *Avrupa Kültür Tarihinde Rönesans* (C.H.P. Konferansları: 16, 1940).
- 6 M. Ş. İpşir[oğlu], *Avrupa*, p. 77.
- 7 M. Ş. İpşir[oğlu], *Avrupa*, pp. 82 and 84.
- 8 Ş. İpşir[oğlu], *Avrupa*, p. 75.
- 9 M. Ş. İpşir[oğlu], *Avrupa*, p. 75.
- 10 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 76.
- 11 The political scientist Dietrich Jung calls the implementation of the Kemalist reform movement a 'cultural transformation of Turkish culture', which entailed the 'deliberate dissolution of Ottoman-Muslim culture'. He goes on then that this 'radical picture of the Kemalist reforms', such as is apparent in the majority of the books dealing with the subject bearing such telling titles as *Phoenix Ascendant: The Rise of Modern Turkey* or *Allah Dethroned: A Journey Through Modern Turkey*, 'served as a smokescreen to hide the continuities between Ottoman modernisation and the formation of a Turkish nation-state'. Jung calls these 'traces' a 'submerged legacy'. D. Jung and W. Piccoli, *Turkey at the Crossroads. Ottoman Legacies and a Greater Middle East* (London and New York: Zed Books, 2001), pp. VII and 61.
- 12 Ahmed Refik, *Hicri Onbirinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı '1000-1100'* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931), pp. 59; Ahmed Refik, *Hicri Onikinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı '1100-1200'* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1930), pp. 240; Ahmed Refik, *Hicri Onüçüncü Asırda İstanbul Hayatı '1200-1255'* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1932), pp. 33.
- 13 *From Court*, pp. 46-7.
- 14 E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey*, p. 189.
- 15 Dr. Rıza Nür, *Türk*, vol. III, p. 57.
- 16 Dr. Rıza Nür, *Türk*, vol. III, p. 58.
- 17 Hülya Küçük, *Bektashi*, p. 231.
- 18 Büşra Ersanlı Behar undertook the study of the Republic's official history (*resmî tarih*) as her doctoral research under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Şerif Mardin. Her subsequently published thesis is currently the best overview of the development of the Turkish History Thesis available. B. E. Behar, *İktidar*.
- 19 Âfet İnan, *Atatürk ve İlim* (Ankara: TTK, 1963), p. 8.
- 20 The *Türk Ocakları* had been re-established on 23 April 1924. F. Georgeon, 'Les foyers turcs à l'époque kémaliste (1923-1931)' in *Turcica*, XIV (1982), pp. 168-215.
- 21 U. İğdemir, *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Türk Tarih Kurumu* (Ankara: TTK, 1973), pp. 3-4.



- 22 *Türk Tarihinin Anahatları* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1930); B. E. Behar, *İktidar*, pp. 102-7.
- 23 *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları - Methal Kısmı* (İstanbul, Devlet Matbaası, 1931) (hereafter abridged to *TTAH*); Semavi Eyice, 'Atatürk'ün büyük bir tarih yazdırma teşebbüsü: Türk Tarihin Ana Hatları' in *Belleten*, XXXII, 128 (October 1968), pp. 509-26.
- 24 Cfr. Yusuf Gedikli (ed.), *Pontus Meselesi*; A. Holly Shissler, *Between Two Empires. Ahmet Ağaoğlu and the New Turkey* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2003).
- 25 The textbook refers to the Ottomans' ancestors as having been one of the Turkish tribes living in Central Asia ('Tataristân-ı Kebir'). Ahmed Vefik could arguably have based himself on Hammer's volumes, which would have been known to him. In his first volume Hammer starts off with characterising the Ottomans as a Turkish tribe originating in Central Asia ('*Turkestan*'), harking back to a remote period in history. Ahmed Vefik, *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Osmanî* (Dersaadet: Matbaa-ı Âmiri, 1286/1869); J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. I (1835), p. I.
- 26 *TTAH*, p. 3.
- 27 *TTAH*, p. 7.
- 28 Italics added. *TTAH*, p. 15.
- 29 *TTAH*, p. 64-8.
- 30 In a previous chapter, the work of Charles Seignobos is dealt with in connection with Ahmed Refik's treatment of Ahmed III's *çesme* in front of the *Bâb-ı Hümayûn*. As outlined there, in a facile manner Seignobos also equated the terms Arab and Islamic (Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 36). *TTAH* p. 69.
- 31 The Turkish authors commented how European specialists such as the historian Ernest Renan and the Orientalist Joseph Halevy had expressed their doubts about this claim. These Europeans had been quick to ascribe these civilisations a Semitic origin, rather than a Central Asian or Turcic one. *TTAH*, pp. 70-1.
- 32 *TTAH*, p.73.
- 33 By way of appendix, a Turkish translation of a lecture delivered by Léon Cahun in 1873 on the 'Turanian' origin of the Arian language in France was included as well. The translation had been executed by Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın]. L. Cahun, 'Fransada Ari Dillere Takaddüm Etmiş Olan Lehçenin Turanî Menşei' in *TTAH*, pp. 75-87.
- 34 Semavi Eyice, 'Atatürk', pp. 509-26.
- 35 The *Türk Ocakları* were absorbed into the *Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası* during the party congress of 15 October 1927. But according to Mete Tunçay, the government was not satisfied with this institution, resolving to abolish it completely and to replace the *Ocaklar* with the *Halkevleri* as sound institutions for the dissemination of the Kemalist ideology throughout the country. The *Halkevleri* were opened on 19 February 1932. Mete Tunçay, *Türk Cumhuriyetinin*, p. 295; E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey*, p. 188; K. N. Duru, *Kemalist Rejimde Öğretim ve Eğitim* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi, 1938), pp. 102-3.
- 36 F. Georgeon, 'Les foyers turcs', p. 209.
- 37 *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi. Maarif Vekaleti ve Türk Tarihi tetkik Cemiyeti tarafından tertip edilmiştir* (Ankara, T.C. Maarif Vekâleti, 1932) (hereafter abridged to *ITTK*).
- 38 'Okuyanlara', in *I. TTK*, p. V.
- 39 Esat Bey occupied the post from 27 September 1930 till 18 September 1932.
- 40 *I. TTK*, p. 5.
- 41 *I. TTK*, p. 10.
- 42 Âfet [İnan], 'Tarihten evvel ve tarih fecrinde' in *I. TTK*, p. 24.

- 43 Âfet [İnan], 'Tarihten evvel', p. 31.
- 44 Âfet [İnan], 'Tarihten evvel', pp. 25 and 31.
- 45 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 42-3.
- 46 B. Toprak, 'Die Institutionalisierung des Laizismus in der türkischen Republik' in J. Blaschke and M. Van Bruinissen (eds), *Thema: Islam und Politik in der Türkei, Jahrbuch zur Geschichte und Gesellschaft des Vorderen und Mittleren Orients 1984* (Berlin, 1984).
- 47 This rather paternalistic attitude seems illustrated in the fact that the election of a Turkish beauty queen, first organised in 1929, was seen by contemporaries as a progressive step towards emulating Western habits. D. Duman and P. Duman, 'Kültürel Bir Değişim Aracı Olarak Güzellik Yarışmaları' in *TTK*, 7, 42 (June 1997), pp. 20-6.
- 48 H. Cemil [Çambel], 'Ege Medeniyetinin Menşesine Umumi bir Bakış' in *I. TTK*, p. 213-4.
- 49 H. Cemil [Çambel], 'Ege Medeniyeti', p. 213-4.
- 50 Y. Ziya [Ortaç], 'Mısır din ve ilâhlarının Türklükle alakası' in *I. TTK*, p. 259.
- 51 Reşit Galip, 'Türk İrk ve Medeniyet Tarihine Umumi bir Bakış' in *I.TTK*, p. 131.
- 52 As Ahmed Refik had done in his school textbook, at the Congress Avram Galanti simply tried to keep abreast of the developments in scientific research in the West. For example, Galanti dealt with the work of Eduard Meyer in his speech, pointing out that this German scholar had unsuccessfully attempted to establish a link between the Hittites and the Sumerians in his *Geschichte des Altertums* (1913). This was a blow to the scientific integrity of the Congress, as the Sumerians were put forward as the first documented Turkish people in the Near East to have established themselves as founders of a high culture. Avram Galanti, in *I. TTK*, pp. 445-51 (448).
- 53 Samih Rifat, in *I. TTK*, pp. 452-71, 472-80 (474-5).
- 54 'Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresine iştirak edenler. Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti Azaları' in *I. TTK*, p. VII.
- 55 Cfr. Chapter II/1, pp. 99-100.
- 56 Yusuf Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak ve Tarih okutmak usullerine dair' in *I. TTK*, pp. 577-607; B. E. Behar *İktidar*, pp. 149-53.
- 57 Yusuf Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak', p. 589.
- 58 Y. Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak', p. 593.
- 59 Y. Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak', p. 595.
- 60 Y. Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak', p. 595.
- 61 Y. Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak', p. 595.
- 62 Y. Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak', p. 595.
- 63 Müderris Ahmet Refik Bey, in *I. TTK*, p. 609.
- 64 Cfr. Chapter II/1, pp. 96-7.
- 65 The lecture was delivered on 10 July. Yusuf Hikmet [Bayur], 'Şarkta İnhitai Sebepleri' in *I. TTK*, pp. 485-530 (511-3).
- 66 Yusuf Hikmet, 'Şark', p. 528.
- 67 Büşra Behar remarks that the third volume of the *Tarih* textbook displays a similar nationalist reading of the Ottoman enterprise. B. Ersanlı. Behar, *İktidar*, p. 113.
- 68 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 75.
- 69 Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 30.
- 70 In a commemorative article, published a year after Atatürk's death, Âfet Hanım relates Mustafa Kemal's criticism of Namık Kemal's well-known phrase in his poem Hürriyet Kasidesi which declares the Turks to have founded a world empire from

- the humble beginnings of a small tribal unit ('Cihangirane bir devlet çıkardık bir aşiretten'). She also stresses the importance of Atatürk's personal encouragement of the archaeological exploration of Anatolia. Âfet İnan, 'Atatürk ve Tarih Tezi', in *Belleten*, III, 10 (1 April 1939), pp. 243-6; M. Namık Kemal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, new ed. (İstanbul, 1326/1910-11), p. 50; *Namık Kemal'in Şairliği ve Bütün Şiirleri*, ed. Önder Göçgün (Ankara: AKM, 1999).
- 71 Semavi Eyice, 'Atatürk', pp. 509-26.
- 72 Unfortunately I have as yet not been able to track down this publication. Ahmed Refik, *Osman oğulları*, Türk Tarihin Ana Hatları, I. Seri no. 32 (İstanbul, 1932), 20 pp.
- 73 Unfortunately I have as yet not been able to track down this publication. Şemsettin [Günaltay], *Müslümanlığının çıktığı ve yayıldığı zamanlarda Orta Asya'nın umumi vaziyeti*, Türk Tarihin Ana Hatları, I. Seri no. 35 (İstanbul, 1932), 89 pp.
- 74 Unfortunately I have as yet not been able to track down this publication. Yusuf Akçura, *Osmanlı devletinin kuruluşu ve bu vakıya dair başlıca menbalar*, Türk Tarihin Ana Hatları, I. Seri no. 52 (İstanbul, 1932), 14 pp.
- 75 Galip Ata [Ataç]'s contribution is illustrative of the true aim of the series: *Sumerlerde hekimlik, Eski Mısır'da hekimlik, İskitlerde hekimlik*, 53 pp. Semavi Eyice, 'Atatürk', p. 523.
- 76 Unfortunately I have as yet not been able to track down these publications. Ahmed Refik, *Osmanoğulları*, Türk Tarihin Ana Hatları, II. Seri no.1 (İstanbul, 1934), 67 pp; Ahmed Refik, *Devşirme usulü*, Türk Tarihin Ana Hatları, II. Seri no.3 (İstanbul, 1934), 11 pp.
- 77 Y.Akçura[oğlu], 'Tarih yazmak', p. 597.
- 78 *Tarih I. Tarihten evvelki zamanlar ve eski zamanlar* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931); *Tarih II. Ortazamanlar* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931); *Tarih III. Yeni ve yakın zamanlarda Osmanlı Türk Tarihi* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931); *Tarih IV. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).
- 79 The committee of writers consisted of M. Tevfik, Samih Rifat, Akçuraoğlu Yusuf, Reşit Galip, Hasan Cemil [Çambel], Âfet [İnan], Baki Bey, İsmail Hakkı [Uzunçarşılı], Reşit Saffet. *Tarih I* (1931), p. VI.
- 80 Kâzım Duru attended a conference in Basel, where the two opposing camps in history education propounded their views. The position taken by Germany and Italy he called 'dynamic' and 'focused', and the side represented by the French, 'static' and 'abstract'. The former maintained that history education should serve a nationalist purpose, whereas the French suggested that history should be practised as an objective science, and serve no other goal but the discovery of truth. Duru recorded that the audience reacted with derision upon hearing the French position. History education in the Republic was thus meant to further a nationalist agenda. The aim of history education was to turn the pupils and later adult citizens away from the preceding Ottoman era, when the Turks had been only one of many groups (*unsur*) living in the Ottoman lands. But this conscious use of education as a means to mould individuals in accordance with state-held beliefs had also been practised by the Ottoman authorities, particularly since the advent of the *Tanzimat* reforms, and during the Hamidian period, as convincingly demonstrated by Selim Deringil. K. N. Duru, *Kemalist Rejimde*, pp. 24, 27, 30-4; Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected*, pp. 93-111.
- 81 Italics in original. *Tarih I* (1931), p. 30.

- 82 Būşra Ersanlı Behar remarks that this volume only contained less than 200 pages, whereas the other three volumes each count circa 400 pages. B. Ersanlı Behar, *İktidar*, p. 113.
- 83 *Tarih III*, pp. 59-68, 68-87 and 88-153.
- 84 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 89.
- 85 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 89. *Tarih III*, p. 59.
- 86 This perception tends to persist till today. *Tarih III* (1931), p. 59.
- 87 *Tarih III*, p. 68. Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 29.
- 88 *Tarih III*, p. 73.
- 89 *Tarih III*, p. 75-6.
- 90 Cfr. Chapters II/2, p. 36 and II/1, pp. 121-2.
- 91 *Tarih III*, pp. 76-7.
- 92 Cfr. Chapters I/1, pp. 16-7 and II/1, pp. 101 and 104.
- 93 *Tarih III*, p. 77.
- 94 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 92.
- 95 *Tarih III*, p. 77.
- 96 *Tarih III*, p. 77.
- 97 Cfr. Chapters I/2, p. 42 and I/3, pp. 69 and 72.
- 98 *Tarih III*, p. 77.
- 99 *Tarih III*, p. 83.
- 100 *Tarih III*, p. 76.
- 101 *Tarih III*, pp. 75-6.
- 102 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 92.
- 103 S. Ertem, 'Tarihî Roman' in *Yedigün*, 4, 179, (12 August 1936), p. 13.
- 104 S. Ertem, 'Tarihî Roman', p. 13.
- 105 After the introduction of the new Turkish alphabet, Kozanoğlu wrote numerous novels on topics relating to the Turks' Islamic past, such as *Battal Gazi Destanı* (1937) or *Sencivanoğlu* (1938).
- 106 Abdullah Ziya Kozanoğlu, *Lâle Devrinde Patronalılar Saltanatı*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1943) (hereafter abridged to *Lâle Devrinde*).
- 107 *Lâle Devrinde*, p. 60.
- 108 *Lâle Devrinde*, p. 3.
- 109 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 38-9.
- 110 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 103.
- 111 Louis de Rouvroy, the duc de Saint-Simon recorded the ambassador's visit in his famous *Mémoires. Mémoires complets et authentiques*, ed. Marquis de Saint Simon, (Paris: A. Sautelet et cie, 1929), vol. XVIII, p. 382.
- 112 *Tarih-i Râşid*, vol. VI, pp. 470-2. The new edition of Selim Nüzhet's book refers to Çelebizâde's phrase as '[ş]eyatini cinsü ins olan taifeyi efrenc'. Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı I Müteferrika Matbaası* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1939), p. 47.
- 113 *Lâle Devrinde*, p. 93.
- 114 İ. Enginün, *Halide Edib Adıvar* (Ankara: Toker, 1986), p. 5.
- 115 İ. Enginün, *Halide*, pp. 49-50 and 78.
- 116 Halide Edib [Adıvar], *Sinekli Bakkal*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Halit Kitabevi, 1942), p. 166.
- 117 B. Çehri, *Türk Romanında Kadın 1923-38 Dönemi* (İstanbul: Simurg, 1996), pp. 84-5.
- 118 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 77.
- 119 *Matbaacılığı*, p. 28, footnote 1.
- 120 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 83.
- 121 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 95.

- 122 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp. 11-4.
- 123 *Sinekli Bakka*, p. 31.
- 124 Claudia Kleinert, *Die Revision der Historiographie des Osmanischen Reiches am Beispiel von Abdülhamid II. (1930-1990)* (Berlin: Schwarz, 1995).
- 125 Ahmed Refik, *Lâle devri*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1932).
- 126 Ahmed Refik, *Çocuklara Türk İstiklâl Harbi* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1929).
- 127 Ahmed Refik, *Türk Mimarları* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1932); Ahmed Refik, *Osmanlı Devrinde Hoca Nüfuzu* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1933).
- 128 Ahmed Refik, *Gönül* (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1932); *Lady M. Wortley Montagu: Şark Mektupları*, ed. Ahmed Refik (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1933).
- 129 The original 1331 edition of *Lâle Devri* was released as part of the series 'Tetebüât-ı Tarihiyye Sahiferi'.
- 130 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 36-7.
- 131 Ahmed Refik, *Lâle devri* (1932), p. 25.
- 132 Bernard Lewis, in his much-acclaimed *Emergence of Modern Turkey*, sets the tone for a misguided appreciation of the *çeyme* in the relevant writing from the second half of the twentieth century onwards. B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, p. 46.
- 133 *Lâle*, p. 88; Ahmed Refik, *Lâle devri* (1932), p. 76.
- 134 Cfr. Chapter I/3, pp. 66-7 and 72-3.
- 135 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 73.
- 136 Ahmed Refik, *Lâle devri* (1932), pp. 27-8.
- 137 *Lâle*, p. 154.
- 138 Ahmed Refik, *Lâle devri* (1932).
- 139 Louis de Chénier, *Révolutions de l'Empire Ottoman, Et observations sur ses progrès, sur ses rêves, & sur l'état présent de cet Empire* (Paris: l'auteur, 1789).
- 140 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 59.
- 141 Musahipzade Celal, *Lâle Devri. Şarkılı Tarihi Operet 3 perde* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi, 1936).
- 142 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp. 11 and 15-6.
- 143 Halit Fahri [Ozansoy], *Nedim. Üç Perdelik Manzum Piyes* (İstanbul, 1932).
- 144 İbrahim Alâettin [Gövsâ], *Nedim* (İstanbul, 1932), pp. 10-1.
- 145 İbrahim Alâettin, *Nedim*, p. 11.
- 146 The author was, however, mistaken about the date of the rebellion forcing down the government (1724). İbrahim Alâettin, *Nedim*, pp. 11 and 13.
- 147 H. Â. Yücel, 'Tarihimizde bir fecri-kâzip ve Nedim' in *Pazartesi Konuşmaları*, p. 231.
- 148 The well-known literary historian Mehmed Kaplan wrote the entry on *Bülbül* in the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, an important publication sponsored by the *Maarif Vekâleti* while Yücel himself occupied that ministerial post. Mehmed Kaplan, 'Bülbül' in *İA* (İstanbul: Maarif Vekâleti, 1944), vol. 2, pp. 832-3.
- 149 H. Â. Yücel, 'fecri-kâzip', p. 230.
- 150 M. Uraz, *Nedim. Yetiştigi Asır, Hayatı, Şahsiyeti ve Şiirlerinden Parçalar* (İstanbul: Tefeyyüz Kitabevi, 1938), pp.4-5.
- 151 M. Uraz, *Nedim*, p. 5.
- 152 M. Uraz, *Nedim*, p. 14.
- 153 Ahmet Cevat [Emre], *Nedim. Hayatı - Seçme Şiirleri* (İstanbul, 1938), p. 3.
- 154 Ahmet Cevat, *Nedim*, p. 3.
- 155 *Türk Tarih Kurumu Ana Tüzüğü* (Ankara: TTK, 1963), p. 1; U. İğdemir, *Cumhuriyetin*, p. 7.
- 156 *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi, İstanbul 20 - 25 Eylül 1937* (Ankara: TTK, 1943).

- 157 Muzafer Göker relates that the Congress was attended by specialists from Turkey, Germany, the United States, Britain, Austria, Bulgaria, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Şemsettin Günaltay, 'Türk Tarih Tezi Hakkındaki İntikâtların Mahiyeti ve Tezin Kat'ı Zaferi' in *Bellesten*, 7-8 (1938), pp. 338-65; Muzafer Göker, 'Le deuxième congres d'histoire turque' in *Bellesten*, II, 5-6 (January-April 1938), p. 4.
- 158 Afet İnan, 'Türk Tarih Kurumunun arkeoloji faaliyeti' in *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*, p. 9.
- 159 The periodical *Kurun* devoted issue 89 completely to the *II. Türk Tarih Kongresi*. In dealing with the results of the congress, the writer Hakkı Süha Gezgin relates how the West had always condemned and despised the Turks. But, he then argues that today these prejudices had been undone by the congress. Hakkı Süha Gezgin, 'Tarih Kongrenin Verimleri' in *Kurun*, 89 (1937), p. 15.
- 160 Nedim Yalansız, 'Cumhuriyet Dönemi Osmanlı', pp. 11-20.
- 161 Cfr. Chapter II/1, pp. 87-9.
- 162 This inscription was found on a leaflet, distributed as an advertising ploy.
- 163 During the previous decade Mamboury published a guide-book to İstanbul (Ernest Mânbüri [Mamboury], *İstanbul Rehber-i Seyyahin* (İstanbul: Risto ve Mahdumu, 1925). This book also received an English translation in the same year (E. Mamboury, *Constantinople: Tourist's Guide* (Constantinople: Rizzo & son, 1925). Throughout the remainder of his career Mamboury continued to publish works of touristic interest while concentrating primarily on Byzantine monuments. Semavi Eyice, 'Mamboury, Ernest' in *DBİA*, vol. V (1994), pp. 283-5.
- 164 E. Mamboury, 'La Turquie Kamâliste Touristique' in *La Turquie Kemaliste*, no. 8 (August 1935), pp. 2-8.
- 165 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc du XVIIIème siècle' in *La Turquie Kemaliste*, no. 19 (June 1937), pp. 2-11.
- 166 E. Mamboury 'L'art turc', p. 3.
- 167 E. Mamboury 'L'art turc', pp. 3-4 and 7.
- 168 Mamboury declares that '[I]e baroque et le rococo, qui ne sont en somme que des jugements péjoratifs inventés par des critiques rigoristes, plutôt que des définitions d'art'. The *TTTC* had earlier condemned the rococo stylistic as 'garbin zevk-siz *rokoko üslubu*' in its history textbook. E. Mamboury 'L'art turc', p. 2 and 10, *Tarih III*, p. 77.
- 169 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 2.
- 170 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 3.
- 171 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 3.
- 172 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 3.
- 173 The author refers to the slightly earlier *yalı* of the former *Sadr-ı Âzam* Amcazâde Hüseyin Paşa in Kanlıca, as possessing a similar internal decoration. E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 3.
- 174 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 7.
- 175 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 7.
- 176 Cfr. Chapter II/1, pp. 101, 103 and 109-10.
- 177 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 7.
- 178 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 62.
- 179 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', pp. 5 and 7.
- 180 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 76.
- 181 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 109.
- 182 E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 8.

- 183 The *TTTC* had earlier singled out the Nuruosmaniye as worthy of criticism, as the first example of the application of 'tasteless *rococo*' decorations in Ottoman İstanbul. E. Mamboury, 'L'art turc', p. 9; *Tarih III*, p. 77.
- 184 Jacob Burckhardt had first stressed the character of 'realism' or 'naturalism' in Renaissance art in his historical guide to the arts of Italy, the *Cicerone* (1855). Mazhar İpşir[oğlu] nevertheless thinks that the Renaissance's impact superseded purely artistic matters. P. Burke, 'Introduction', in *The Civilization of the Renaissance*, pp. 2 and 7; Mazhar Şevket İpşir[oğlu], *Rönesans Sanatı* (İstanbul: İÜ Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1942), p. 15.
- 185 Ali Canib, 'Rönesans', p. 6.
- 186 Cfr. *supra*. Mazhar Şevket İpşir[oğlu], *Rönesans Sanatı*, p. III.
- 187 Cfr. *Supra*. H. Â. Yücel, 'fecri-kâzip', pp. 228-34.
- 188 H. Â. Yücel, 'fecri-kâzip', p. 229.
- 189 H. Â. Yücel, 'fecri-kâzip', pp. 229-30.
- 190 H. Â. Yücel, 'fecri-kâzip', p. 231.
- 191 Cfr. Chapter I/3, pp. 75 and 78-9.

## Chapter II/3

The 'Tulip Age' as a Prelude to the *Tanzimat*:

## The Re-Appreciation of the Ottomans and Islam, 1940-47

- 1 E. J. Zürcher, "Fundamentalism" as an Exclusionary Device in Kemalist Turkish Nationalism' in W. van Schendel and E. J. Zürcher (eds), *Identity Politics in Central Asia and the Muslim World: Nationalism, Ethnicity and Labour in the Twentieth Century* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), pp. 207-20.
- 2 This text was 'in many ways an anti-Nutuk' which painted a slightly different picture of events. E. J. Zürcher, 'Young Turk Memoirs as a Historical source', in *MES*, 22, 4 (1986), pp. 564-6. See also Chapter II/1, endnote (14), p. 229.
- 3 The university was subsequently renamed *Darülfünûn-ı Osmanî* (1908) and *İstanbul Darülfünûnu* (1924). M. Katoğlu, 'Cumhuriyet', pp. 397-401.
- 4 Cemil Bilsel, *İstanbul Üniversitesinin Tarihi* (İstanbul: İÜ Yayınları, 1943), p. 25-6; A. Arslan, *Darülfünun'dan Üniversite'ye* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1995).
- 5 Salih Murad, 'Darülfünun ve M. Malç', in *Cumhuriyet* (25 February 1932).
- 6 The report was subsequently published by the government. Malche was very critical of the methods used to instruct students. He thought that the traditional insistence on memorising information, which could arguably be seen as a trait indicating the continued preponderance of a Muslim mentality, was particularly disadvantageous. Instead he suggested that students should display initiative and drive. Additionally, he also commented upon the high numbers of academic staff attached to the *Darülfünun* and the low wages they were receiving. A. Malche, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hakkında Rapor* (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1939), pp. 7, 33 and 44.
- 7 A. Cevat [Emre], 'Darülfünunumuzun [İ]slâhı için bir Anket yapmağa ve bir rapor vermeye memur edilen Profesör Malche ile Mülâkat' in *Muhit*, IV, 44 (June 1932), pp. 38-9.
- 8 'Profesör Malche ile Mülâkat', p. 39.
- 9 Ali Süreyya, 'İstanbul Darülfünunu ve Millî Türk Tarihi', in *Cumhuriyet* (17 June 1932).
- 10 Cemil Bilsel, *İstanbul Üniversitesi*, pp. 31, 31-4 (text law).
- 11 Cemil Bilsel, *İstanbul Üniversitesi*, p. 31.
- 12 M. Tunçay and H. Özen, '1933 Tasfiyesinden Önce Darülfünun' in *Yapıt*, 7 (October-November 1984), pp. 5-28; M. Tunçay and H. Özen, '1933 Darülfünun Tasfiyesi' in *Yeni Gündem* (October 1984), pp. 16-9.
- 13 *İstanbul Üniversitesi Nizam defteri, 1933-1970* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, s. a.).
- 14 *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 96.
- 15 The university's Islamic Research Institute (İslâm Araştırmaları Enstitüsü) was founded in 1953, when Turkey was governed by the Islam-friendly Demokrat Parti under Prime Minister Adnan Menderes. [www.istanbul.edu.tr/edebiyat/edebyat/dekanlik/arastirma\\_merkezleri/islam\\_arastirma\\_merkezi.htm](http://www.istanbul.edu.tr/edebiyat/edebyat/dekanlik/arastirma_merkezleri/islam_arastirma_merkezi.htm); M. Tunçay and H. Özen, '1933 Darülfünun Tasfiyesi', p. 16.
- 16 Cfr. Chapter II/2, pp. 116-7.
- 17 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 89.
- 18 *Tarihi Sevdiren*, pp. 98-9.
- 19 Ahmed Refik, 'Tarihte Gazi' in *Yedigün*, 2, 33 (29 October 1933), pp. 5 and 25.
- 20 Ahmed Refik, 'Tarihte Gazi', p. 25.
- 21 Ahmed Refik, 'Tarihte Gazi', p. 5.
- 22 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 74. Ahmed Refik, *Padişahlarımızda Din Gayreti ve Vatan Muhabbeti* (İstanbul, 1332/1916-17), p. 3.



- 23 Quoted in *Taribi Sevdiren*, p.82.
- 24 Cfr. *Namuk Kemâl'in Şairliği ve bütün Şiirleri*, ed. Önder Göçgün.
- 25 Ahmed Refik, *Büyük Tarih-i Umûmî*, vol. VI, p. 415.
- 26 Cfr. Chapter II/2, pp. 118-9.
- 27 Cfr. Chapter II/2, pp. 121-2.
- 28 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 100.
- 29 Ahmed Refik, *Umûmî Tarih* (1926), p. 70.
- 30 The anecdote involves a meeting of the two men in the nightclub on Büyük Ada, where Atatürk obliged Ahmed Refik to mount a chair and publicly announce his ignorance of history, in particular Turkish history. N. A. Banoğlu, *Nükte ve Fıkralarla Atatürk*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (İstanbul: İnkılap, 1978), pp. 505-6.
- 31 In spite of Ahmed Refik's emotional link with the Ottomans, and his apparent distaste for the *Tarih Tezi* and the *Güneş-Dil Teorisi*, after his dismissal from the university, he continued his historical work and even wrote an article on the Turks' rediscovered ancestors, the Sumerians. Ahmed Refik, 'Sümerlilerin kurduğu medeniyet ve tesirleri' in *Cumhuriyet*, (14 November 1935).
- 32 *Yedigün*, 5, 241 (20 October 1937), p. 1.
- 33 İ. A. Gövsa, 'Ahmet Refik . . .' in *Yedigün*, 5, 241 (20 October 1937), p. 9.
- 34 İ. A. Gövsa, 'Ahmet Refik', p. 9.
- 35 İ. A. Gövsa, 'Ahmet Refik', p. 9.
- 36 Falih Rıfki [Atay], 'Ahmet Refik', in *Yedigün*, 5, 241 (20 October 1937), p. 4.
- 37 Falih Rıfki, 'Ahmet Refik', p. 4.
- 38 Cfr. Chapter II/2, pp. 121-2.
- 39 Falih Rıfki, 'Ahmet Refik', p. 4.
- 40 Falih Rıfki, 'Ahmet Refik', p. 4.
- 41 Cemil Bilsel, *İstanbul Üniversitesi*, p. 28.
- 42 At that date, Yücel became a member of the second Celal Bayar government (11 November 1938-25 January 1939). Yücel remained *Maarif Vekili* until 5 August 1946 (second Şükrü Saraçoğlu government (15 March 1943 - 5 August 1946). M. Çıkar, *Hasan-Âli Yücel ve Kültür Reformu*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1998).
- 43 A. H. Tanpınar, 'Hasan Âli Yücel'e Dair Hatıralar ve Düşünceler' in *Yeni Ufuklar*, 109 (1961), pp. 1-10.
- 44 A. M. C. Şengör, *Hasan-Âli Yücel ve Türk Aydınlanmasının Metabilimsel Temelleri* (Ankara: Yükseköğretim Kurulu Matbaası, 1998), p. 112.
- 45 Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar describes Yücel as a figure who '[b]ir yandan Mevlana'nın rubailerini çevirirken, öbür yandan Goethe'nin hayatını yaza[r]', indicating the blending of both cultures in the intellectual Yücel's outlook. A. H. Tanpınar, 'Hasan Âli Yücel'e Dair Hatıralar', pp. 1-10; A. G. Sayar, *Hasan Ali Yücel'in Tasavvufi Dünyası ve Mevlevîliği* (İstanbul: Ötügen, 2002).
- 46 This short piece was in fact an obituary for Ahmed Refik. Hasan Ali Yücel, 'Ahmed Refik'. Quoted in *Taribi Sevdiren*, p.59.
- 47 Z. Arıkan, 'Hasan-Âli Yücel ve Tarih Bilinci' in *TvT*, 28, 166, (October 1997), pp. 4-12.
- 48 In an essay written after the end of his tenure as *Maarif Vekili*, Yücel did not shy away from mildly criticising the History Thesis. This criticism was published in 1947, but Yücel had finished writing it a year previously (28 September 1946). He describes the *Tarih Tezi* as one of the important cultural movements of the Republic, transporting the newly awakened national consciousness to past ages (p. 291). Yücel calls certain aspects of the Thesis 'exaggerated', but nevertheless stressed the impor-

- tance of the *Tarih Tezi* in political terms. Hasan-Âli Yücel clearly recognised the importance of the Thesis as a political tool in Atatürk's attempt to forge a Turkish nation, a Turkish nation state within the confines of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace. Z. Arıkan, 'Hasan-Âli Yücel', p. 7; H. Â. Yücel, 'Tarihte Metot' in *Bilimler Felsefesi Mantık* (Ankara: MEB, 1947), pp. 269-93.
- 49 H.-Â. Yücel in *Tercüme* (19 May 1940), p. 2.
- 50 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 78.
- 51 *Tanzimat. Yüzcüncü yıldönümü münasebetile, I* (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1940).
- 52 S. M. Arsal, 'Teokratik Devlet ve Lâik Devlet' in *Tanzimat* (1940), pp. 59-95.
- 53 S. M. Arsal, 'Teokratik Devlet', p. 79.
- 54 The treaty's third article stipulates the position of the Crimean Tatars as an independent entity, yet acknowledges Ottoman suzerainty in religious affairs given the fact that the sultan was universally recognised as the Caliph of Islam. *Recueil d'actes internationaux*, pp. 321-2 (article 3).
- 55 S. M. Arsal, 'Teokratik Devlet', p. 80.
- 56 S. M. Arsal, 'Teokratik Devlet', p. 80.
- 57 In his writings, Ahmed Refik views the *ulema's* growing preponderance in Ottoman affairs to have constituted the primary reason for the Ottomans' laggard position on the stage of world civilisation. Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 25, 44-6, 49-50 and 56-7; I/3, pp. 79-82.
- 58 F. Çöker (ed.), *Türk Tarih Kurumu. Kuruluş Amacı ve Çalışmaları* (Ankara: TTK, 1983), p. 486.
- 59 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel Garplılığa Hareketleri' in *Tanzimat*, pp. 13-30.
- 60 The four sub-headings are 'I. Garplılığa hareketinin başlangıcı' (pp. 13-6), 'II. Garplılığa hareketinin umumî karakteri' (pp. 16-9), 'III. Garplılığa hareketinin merhaleleri' (pp. 19-29) and 'IV. Netice' (pp. 29-30).
- 61 Karal claims the 'Tulip Age' to have been the first stage in the movement of Westernisation sweeping through Turkey. E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', pp. 19-20 ('III.a-Lâle Devri').
- 62 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 15 and 19-20
- 63 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 15.
- 64 The historian had written about such methodological issues in the TTK's own publication. İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Yeni Türk Tarihinde vesikacılık' in *Belleten*, II, 7-8 (July-September 1938), pp. 367-71; İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Tarihte vesikacılığın ehemmiyetine dair küçük bir misal' in *Belleten*, II, 7-8, (July-September 1938), pp. 373-8.
- 65 Cfr. *Supra*,
- 66 İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Sadrâzam Halil Hamid Paşa' in *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, V, (1935), pp. 213-67.
- 67 İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Sadrâzam', I, pp. 213-4.
- 68 İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Sadrâzam', I, pp. 213-4.
- 69 İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Sadrâzam', I, p. 214.
- 70 İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Sadrâzam', I, p. 213.
- 71 Uzunçarşılı also wrote in-depth articles on Halil Hamid's contemporaries who had also been active in attempting to reform the Empire. 'Vezir Hakkı Mehmed Paşa, 1747-1811' in *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 6 (1936-39), pp. 177-284; 'Cezayirli Gazi Hasan Paşa'ya dair' in *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 7-8, (1940-42), pp. 17-40.
- 72 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 16. Karal's verdict appears in some ways to have been shared by Hasan Âli Yücel, as he speaks about 'Tanzimat ve daha evvelki uyanma devri' in *Tercüme*. H. Â. Yücel in *Tercüme* (19 May 1940), p. 2.

- 73 One only has to remember the publications dealing with Nedim to understand Karal's sentence.
- 74 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 21.
- 75 Cfr. Chapter II/1, pp. 100-1, 103-4 and 109-10; II/2, pp. 137-9.
- 76 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 19.
- 77 Cfr. Chapter II/2, p. 127. *Tarih III* (1931), p.77.
- 78 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 19; S. N. Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı I. Müteferrika Matbaası*, (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1939). Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 104.
- 79 S. N. Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı* (1939), p. 44. Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 105-9.
- 80 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 19.
- 81 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 19.
- 82 Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek], *Türk Gazeteciliği*, (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931), pp. 8-9.
- 83 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 19.
- 84 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 20.
- 85 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 29.
- 86 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', pp. 29-30.
- 87 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 29.
- 88 E. Z. Karal, 'Tanzimattan evvel', p. 29.
- 89 Ö. L. Barkan, 'Tanzimat Tetkiklerinin Ortaya Koyduğu Bazı Meseleler' in *İÜİFM*, II/2 (1941), pp. 288-329.
- 90 Bloch was one of the founders of the so-called *Annales* (1922) school of historiography which placed a great emphasis on the socio-economic aspects of history, largely ignored previously. His studies of rural France and its feudal society, such as *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française* (1931), must have played a large role in determining Barkan's outlook and practice as a historian upon his return to Turkey. Halil İnalçık, 'Impact of the *Annales* School on Ottoman Studies and New Findings' in *JFBC* (1978), pp. 69-96; P. Burke, *The French Historical Revolution. The Annales School 1929-89* (Cambridge: Polity, 1990); C. Fink, *Marc Bloch* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989).
- 91 Nedim Yalansız, 'Cumhuriyet', p. 15; H. Sahillioğlu, 'Ömer Lütfi Barkan' in *İÜİFM*, 41, 1/4 (September 1982).
- 92 Ö. L. Barkan, 'Türk Toprak Hukuku Tarihinde Tanzimat ve 1274 (1858) tarihli Arazi Kanunnamesi' in *Tanzimat*, pp. 321-421.
- 93 Ö. L. Barkan, 'Tanzimat Tetkiklerinin', pp. 288 and 291.
- 94 Italics in original. Ö. L. Barkan, 'Tanzimat Tetkiklerinin', p. 295.
- 95 Ö. L. Barkan, 'Tanzimat Tetkiklerinin', p. 318.
- 96 Ö. L. Barkan, 'Tanzimat Tetkiklerinin', p. 318.
- 97 The *EI* was purportedly modelled on the so-called 'Pauly-Wissowa', the *Realencyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1894-1978).
- 98 *İslâm Ansiklopedisi. İslâm Âlemi Tarih, Coğrafya, Etnografya ve Bibliografya Lûgati*, I, 1. - 9. cüz, âb - 'atama, (İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1942), title-page.
- 99 Karal also wrote the entries on Barbaros Hayrettin Paşa, Sultans Mahmud II, Mehmed V and Mehmed VI, as well as various topics under the heading of Atatürk. Twelve volumes of the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* were published between 1940 and 1974.
- E. Z. Karal, 'Ahmet III.' in *İA* (1942), vol. I, pp. 165-8.
- 100 E. Z. Karal, 'Ahmet III.', p. 167.
- 101 Cfr. chapter II/2, pp. 115-6.
- 102 Cfr. chapter II/2, p. 116.

- 103 Arent Jan Wensinck maintains that '[t]he prohibition of wine [and other alcoholic intoxicants] was not in Muhammed's programme at the beginning'. But the Prophet's subsequent acquaintance with the 'consequences of drunkenness . . . are said to have led Muhammed to change his attitude'. In particular *Sura V*, 92 brings an end to the habit of drinking wine amongst Muslims, calling it 'an abomination of the work of Satan'. A. J. Wensinck, 'Khamr', in *EI*, new ed. (1978), vol. IV, pp. 994-7. In the next world ('Paradise'), however, the consumption of wine is allowed and even encouraged. *Sura XLVII*: 15 speaks of the rivers of Paradise, including 'rivers of wine - a delight to the drinkers'.
- 104 Law no. 790 regulating the production and the sale of alcoholic beverages (*Meşrûbât-ı Kültülye Kanunu*) was issued in 1926, and the government monopoly which had thus been established received the name *tekel* in 1932. S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 385; İ. Özer, *Tekel*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1967).
- 105 E. Z. Karal, 'Ahmet III.', p. 167
- 106 Enver Ziya Karal, *Selim III.ün Hatt-ı Hümayunları. Harpler ve İsyanlar* (Ankara: TTK, 1942); Enver Ziya Karal, *Selim III.ün Hatt-ı Hümayunları. Nizam-ı Cedid* (Ankara: TTK, 1946); Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi, Cilt V: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)* (Ankara: TTK, 1947).
- 107 Even though more recently, scholars such as Ahmet Evin or Kemal Silay do not replicate Karal's exact phrasing, their adherence to the models proposed in the *Tanzimat* volume and the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* entries appears obvious. Evin's influential article, for instance, starts from the premise that the 'Tulip Age' witnessed 'the formation of a *Weltanschauung* which included the possibility of introducing novelties at the expense of traditional norms', a '*Weltanschauung*' that functioned 'in terms of the rise of a new mentality'. Silay puts forward that Damad İbrahim's *sadâret* coincided with 'a serious movement towards a secular society'. A. Ö. Evin, 'The Tulip Age', p. 135; K. Silay, *Nedim*, p. 79.
- 108 F. R. Unat, 'Ahmet III. Devrine Ait bir İslahat Takriri', in *TV*, I, 2 (August 1941), pp. 107-21
- 109 Cfr. Chapter I/1, endnote (12), pp. 203-4.
- 110 F. R. Unat, 'Anadolu ve Rumeli Müdafaa-i Huku Cemiyetinin Kuruluşuna dair Vesikalar'; İ. Sungu, 'Harf İnkılabı ve Millî Şef İsmet İnönü' in *TV*, I, 1 (June 1941), pp. 1-9; 10-9.
- 111 T. Öz, 'Selim III., Mustafa IV. ve Mahmud II. zamanlarına ait birkaç vesika'; M. C. Baysun, 'Mustafa Reşid Paşa'nın Paris ve Londra sefareterleri esnasındaki siyasi yazıları' in *TV*, I, 1 (June 1941), pp. 20-9, 30-44.
- 112 F. R. Unat, 'Ahmet III. Devrine Ait', pp. 107-21.
- 113 B. Kütükoğlu, 'Vekâyinüvis', pp. 282-3.
- 114 *Vakanüvis Es'ad Efendinin Tarihi*, ed. Z. Yılmaz (İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2000).
- 115 *Vakanüvis Es'ad*, p. 586.
- 116 N. Berkes, *The Development*, p. 31.
- 117 F. R. Unat, 'Ahmet III. Devrine Ait', footnote [3], p. 107.
- 118 Unat recounts that Esad Efendi presented this document without any kind of reference or indication of a source. One thus has to conclude that he had discovered this document in the holdings of the imperial palace to which he had free access as the official chronicler of the Ottoman state. F. R. Unat, 'Ahmet III. Devrine Ait', p. 107.
- 119 The words in the *lâyiha* seem confirmed by Childs's appraisal of the standing army, created in western Europe between 1648 and 1714. His claim is that seventeenth-

- and eighteenth-century observers associated the mere mention of the notion of a standing army with a 'professional, controlled, relatively homogeneous body of troops' and the phrase as such became 'synonymous with an absolute monarchy, a coercive political instrument used in internal affairs as well as against foreign opponents.' J. Childs, *Armies and Warfare in Europe*, p. 28; *Vakaniüvis Es'ad*, p. 594.
- 120 According to Wiliam McNeill, such a de-personalized army, when 'in good working order', 'could sweep all opponents from the field who were not organized, equipped, and trained in substantially the same fashion'. W. H. McNeill, *Europe's Steppe Frontier 1500-1800* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 129-30; *Vakaniüvis Es'ad*, p. 595.
- 121 *Vakaniüvis Es'ad*, p. 596.
- 122 *Vakaniüvis Es'ad*, p. 599.
- 123 *Vakaniüvis Es'ad*, p. 599.
- 124 According to Anton Schaendlinger the *lâyiha* must have been composed and presented to the Grand Vezir prior to the conclusion of the Treaty of Passarowitz (21 July 1718). A. C. Schaendlinger, 'Die Entdeckung', p. 94; *Vakaniüvis Es'ad*, p. 586.
- 125 F.R. Unat, 'Ahmet III. Devrine Ait'.
- 126 B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, p. 45.
- 127 N. Berkes, *The Development*, p. 30.
- 128 A. C. Schaendlinger, 'Die Entdeckung'.
- 129 Schaendlinger declares that the 'Großwesir Damad Ibrahim Paşa im höchsten Maße' reform policies 'gefördert und angeregt [hatt]', a phrase that seems remarkably close to Lewis's appraisal of Damad İbrahim. A. C. Schaendlinger, 'Die Entdeckung', p. 91; B. Lewis, *The Emergence*, p. 45.
- 130 F. R. Unat, 'Ahmed III. devrinde yapılmış bir Önasya haritası' in *TV*, I, 2 (August 1941), p. 160.
- 131 As a native of Kazan, Kurat devoted a number of studies to the Turks of Central Asia and Russia in the 1930s. A. N. Kurat, *XII Karl'ın Türkiyede kalışı ve bu sıralarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (İstanbul: Koskun Matbaası, 1943); A. N. Kurat, 'XVIII. Yüzyıl Başı Avrupa "Umumî Harbi"nde Türkiye'nin Tarafızlığı' in *Belleten*, VII, 17 (1943), pp. 245-72.
- 132 Ahmed Refik, *Memâlik-i Osmaniyede Demirbaş Şarî* (İstanbul: Hilâl Matbaası, 1332/1916), 123 pp.
- 133 M. Tayyib Gökbilgin had earlier published a study on a similar topic. He had unearthed and published hitherto unknown documents pertaining to the Hungarian immigrant Férenc Rákoczi. His article does not contain a direct reference to the 'Tulip Age' however. M. T. Gökbilgin, 'II. Racoczi Ferenc ve tevabiine dair yeni vesikalar' in *Belleten*, V/20 (1941), pp. 577-95.
- 134 A. N. Kurat, 'XVIII. Yüzyıl Başı', p. 258.
- 135 A. N. Kurat, 'XVIII. Yüzyıl Başı', p. 259.
- 136 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 75.
- 137 A. N. Kurat, *XII Karl*, p. 18. Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 40.
- 138 A. N. Kurat, 'XVIII. Yüzyıl Başı', p. 258.
- 139 Ahmed III was an accomplished calligrapher who had studied under the renowned Hafız Osman, while living at his father's palace in Edirne. This trait of the Sultan had been largely ignored by previous scholars. But Kurat's mention of the pictorial skills of Sultan Ahmed III was probably nothing but the product of the author's fancy. A. N. Kurat, *XII Karl*, pp. 19 and 21; A. Alparslan, 'Some Ottoman Sultans as Calligraphers' in *The 8th International Congress of Turkish Art, Cairo 26 September-1 October 1987* (Cairo: Matba`at Hay'at al-Athar al-Misriyah, 1987), p. 80.

- 140 A. N. Kurat, *XII Karl*, p. 22.
- 141 A. N. Kurat, *XII Karl*, p. 22.
- 142 Cfr. Chapters I/1, p. 13 and I/3, pp. 69 and 73.
- 143 J. de Hammer, *Histoire*, vol. XIV, pp. 232-3.
- 144 Cemil Bilsel, *İstanbul Üniversitesi*, p. 94.
- 145 Selim Nüzhet's reference reads 'Doktor Osman Şevkî Bey: Türk Tabâbeti Tarihi sahife 213'. He recounts how Damad İbrahim's concern with the health of the population had induced the Vezir to have Sultan Ahmed III publish a 'fermân' ensuring that all medical practitioners would be forced to undergo an examination. Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı*, pp. 26-7.
- 146 Cfr. Chapter II/2, pp. 118-9.
- 147 A leftist sympathiser like Zeki Sarıhan can nowadays proclaim that 'Cumhuriyet devrimcileri Osmanlı'ya düşmandır', indicating the extreme unwillingness of the Kemalists in the 1920s and 30s to deal with the Ottomans. Z. Sarıhan, 'Cumhuriyet Devrimi'nin Osmanlı'ya bakışı' in *BÜ*, 59 (May 1999), p. 31.
- 148 Cemil Bilsel, *İstanbul Üniversitesi*, p. 53.
- 149 M. Kaplan, in A. H. Tanpınar, *19uncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1988), p. XIII; F. Akün, 'Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar' in *TDED*, XII, 10, pp. 1-32.
- 150 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1942), pp. 1-15.
- 151 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, p. 1.
- 152 Cfr. Chapter I/3, p. 79.
- 153 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, pp. 3-4.
- 154 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, p. 8.
- 155 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, p. 8.
- 156 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, p. 8.
- 157 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, p. 9.
- 158 A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, p. 11.
- 159 As such, the author seems to have regarded the whole of the eighteenth century as an era of reform and renewal movements. A. H. Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, p. 12.
- 160 In the essay on İstanbul, Tanpınar simply says 'İbrahim Paşa'nın başladığı her şey I. Mahmud zamanında devam eder', speaking about 'Lâle Devri ve onun devamı olan yıllarda'. However, his personal appreciation of the positive aspects of the 'Tulip Age' was confused. At an earlier stage he had claimed that the extent of the accomplishments of the 'Tulip Age' was limited to a few 'copies' of French-style architectonic elements. A. H. Tanpınar, *Beş Şehir*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (İstanbul: Dergâh, 1979), pp. 93, 95-6.
- 161 Saraçaoğlu led the government between 9 June 1942 and 8 March 1943, only to be appointed to lead the next government as well (15 March 1943-5 May 1946).
- 162 Robert W. Olson, 'The Remains of Talat', in *DWDI*, 26, ¼ (1986), pp. 46-56.
- 163 *III. Türk Tarih Kongresi Ankara, 15 - 20 Kasım 1943* (Ankara: TTK, 1948).
- 164 Ş. Günaltay, in *III. TTK*, p. 2.
- 165 At that time, Yücel apparently had not yet fully developed his academic detachment from Atatürk, which would allow him in the coming years to offer a re-appraisal of the *Türk Tarih Tezi*. H. Â. Yücel, in *III. TTK*, p. 8.
- 166 M. E. Tekiner, 'Tarihimizde noksanlar nasıl tamamlanabilir' in *III. TTK*, p. 466 and 469.
- 167 Cfr. Chapter I/1, pp. 10-1; endnote (13), p. 203. F. Çöker, *Türk Tarih Kurumu*, p. 500.

- 168 A. C. Yöntem, 'Nedim'in hayatı ve çağdaşlarının üstündeki tesirleri' in *III. TTK*, p. 109-21.
- 169 A. C. Yöntem, 'Nedim', p. 121.
- 170 Cfr. Chapter II/1, p. 104.
- 171 A. C. Yöntem, 'Nedim', p. 113.
- 172 A. C. Yöntem, 'Nedim', pp. 109 and 114.
- 173 A. C. Yöntem, 'Nedim', p. 112.
- 174 A. C. Yöntem, 'Nedim', p. 121.
- 175 *1730 Patrona İhtilâlı Hakkında Bir Eser: Abdi Tarihi*, ed. F. R. Unat (Ankara: TTK, 1943), II. seri-no.10.
- 176 *1730 Patrona*, p. IX.
- 177 *1730 Patrona*, p. X. Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 25.
- 178 E. Z. Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi, Cilt V: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)* (Ankara: TTK 1947).
- 179 E. Z. Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, p. 9.
- 180 E. Z. Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, p. 196.
- 181 *IV. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 10 - 14 Kasım 1948* (Ankara: TTK, 1952).
- 182 Sedar Alp had studied in Germany since 1932. Upon his return he was appointed to the Ankara Üniversitesi. Alp was the first Turkish Hittitologist. F. Çöker, *Türk Tarih Kurumu*, pp. 641-2.
- 183 Sedar Alp, 'Hitit Devletinin iç bünyesi' in *IV. TTK*, pp. 44-5.
- 184 E. Tekiner, 'Nedim ve Damad İbrahim Paşa mezarları' in *IV. TTK*, pp. 174-77.
- 185 B. S. Baykal, 'Patrona Halil ayaklanması ile ilgili kaynaklar hakkında' in *IV. TTK*, pp. 177-82.
- 186 B. S. Baykal, 'Patrona', p. 181.
- 187 Cfr. Chapter I/2, pp. 50-1.
- 188 B. S. Baykal, 'Patrona', p. 182.
- 189 As a matter of fact, already in the 1930s such books had been published, as demonstrated by a search in the catalogue of the Milli Kütüphane (Ankara). Nevertheless the 1940s saw an explosion of these religious guide-books in Turkey. M. Z. Korgunal, *Namaz Hocası ve Namaz Süreleri* (İstanbul: Mehmet Baki, 1944).
- 190 M. Z. Korgunal, *Namaz*, pp. 7 and 17.
- 191 M. Z. Korgunal, *Namaz*, pp. 3, 3-4 and 5-6.
- 192 C. Koçak, 'Siyasal Tarih', pp. 130 and 605.
- 193 Statues and paintings of Mustafa Kemal began appearing from October 1926 onwards. The continued use of such visual reminders of Atatürk's place in the Turkish people's hearts and minds indicates that this cult is still part of Turkey's 'official culture', as pointed out by Zürcher. Even though nowadays one can very well read criticism of Atatürk and his reform policies, published and publicised by the ever-growing Islamist press and its supporters. S. J. Shaw, *History*, vol. II, p. 385; E. J. Zürcher, *Turkey*, p. 190; Hakan Albayrak, *Kemalizm Terakkiye Mânidir* (Vadi Yayınları, 2004).
- 194 The book was published in four volumes (1947-55) by the Türkiye Basımevi, founded in 1925 by Demiray himself.
- 195 Tahsin Demiray, in İ. H. Danişmend, *İzablı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi* (İstanbul: Türkiye Basımevi, 1947), vol. I, p. V.
- 196 Turkey joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in February 1952 after two years of lobbying. D. Barchard, *Turkey and the West* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), pp. 52-7.
- 197 Tahsin Demiray, in *İzablı*, p. V.

- 198 İ. H. Danişmend, *İzahlı*, p. XIV.
- 199 Mete Tunçay, writing in the critically well-received *Türkiye Tarihi*, avows that the latter CHP governments had already begun to display a more lenient attitude towards Islam in the late 1940s. M. Tunçay, 'Siyasal Tarih (1950-1960)', in *Türkiye Tarihi*, vol. 4, p. 178.
- 200 The Kemalist establishment also patronised new research on the figure of Ahmed Cevdet during the 1940s. E. Mardin, *Medenî Hukuk Cephesinden Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, (1822-1895) Ölümün 50inci yıldönümü vesilesile* (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet matbaası, 1946).



**Epilogue: The Politics of History, 1908-50**

- ‘Épître A Son Excellence Monseigneur Le Comte de Noailles’ in D. Cantemir, *Histoire de l’Empire Ottoman, où se voyent les causes de son aggrandissement et de sa décadence*, vol. I (Paris: J.-N. Le Clerc, 1743), no page number.
- 1 The French original reads ‘une réaction marquée des moeurs occidentales sur celles de l’Orient’. Cfr. Chapter I/2, p. 55.
  - 2 Unfortunately I have not been able to consult Hanotaux’s original text (*De l’histoire et des historiens*, 1919). Ahmed Refik first published a serialisation of his translation in *Hayat*, during early 1928. Later the Kanaat Kütüphanesi published the text in book form. *Tarihi Sevdiren*, pp. 308 and 402, no. 616 and 923.
  - 3 G. Hanotaux, *Tarih ve Müverrihler*, ed. Ahmed Refik (İstanbul, 1932), pp. 13-20 (‘2. Tarih bir San’attır’), 20-35 (‘3. Tarih bir ilimdir’).
  - 4 G. Hanotaux, *Tarih*, p. 14.
  - 5 G. Hanotaux, *Tarih*, pp. 15 and 20.
  - 6 ‘Muharririmize neler anlatıyor’ quoted in *Tarihi Sevdiren*, p. 34.
  - 7 Hayden White calls the nineteenth century ‘the classic age of historical narrative’, when historians wrote accounts disclosing ‘the force of a moral judgment on the events [they] related’. V. Hayden White, ‘The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality’ in *The Content of the Form*, p. 22; V. Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore, 1973).
  - 8 Ahmed Refik’s attitude towards texts produced by his European contemporaries is illustrated in his appraisal of Vandal’s book dealing with the seventeenth-century French Ambassador the Marquis de Nointel (Albert Vandal, *L’odyssée d’un ambassadeur. Les voyages du Marquis de Nointel (1670-1680)* (Paris, 1900). Ahmed Refik called this book an important source (even calling it a ‘document’ or ‘vesika’) regarding the study of Fazıl Ahmed Paşa’s policies. In other words, it would appear that the mere fact that a study on the Ottoman past had been executed by a European historian validated the resulting text in such a way that Ahmed Refik did not just regard such a work as an interesting secondary source, but as a primary source in its own right, as indicated by his usage of the word ‘vesika’, betraying a Rankean respect for documentary material. G. G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century. From Scientific Objectivity to Postmodern Challenge* (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1997), p. 5; Ahmed Refik, *Fransız*, p. 55.
  - 9 Peter Burke describes the ‘Whig interpretation of history’ as ‘the use of the past to justify the present’. P. Burke, ‘Origins of Cultural History’ in *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), p. 1.
  - 10 Ahmed Refik studied the past ‘with one eye . . . upon the present’, to quote Butterfield. Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London: G. Bell, 1931), p. 31; Sir D. Brogan, ‘Sir Herbert Butterfield as a Historian: an Appreciation’ in J. H. Elliott and H. G. Koenigsberger (eds), *The Diversity of History: Essays in Honour of Sir Herbert Butterfield* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), pp. 1-15.
  - 11 V. Hayden White, ‘The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality’, p. 21.
  - 12 V. Hayden White, ‘The Politics of Historical Interpretation: Discipline and De-Sublimation’ in *The Content of the Form*, p. 67.

# Index

- A -

- Abdülaziz (1830-76) 11, 36, 98  
Abdülhak Adnan [Adivar] (1881-1955) 129  
Abdülhamid I (1725-89) 68, 77  
Abdülhamid II (1842-1918, r. 1876-1909) 49, 56, 131, 142, 147, 209, 218  
Abdullah Ziya [Kozanoğlu] (1906-66) 128, 129  
Abdurrahman Şeref (1853-1925) 10, 54, 55, 73, 95, 96, 110, 170, 224, 225  
Académie française 12  
Acemperestî 16  
Adivar, Adnan. See Abdülhak Adnan [Adivar]  
Adivar, Halide Edib. See Halide Edib [Adivar]  
Âfet İnan (1908-1985) 117, 118, 119, 120, 124, 135, 241  
Afghani. See Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani  
Ağaoğlu Ahmed Bey (1869-1939) 118  
Ağaoğlu, Ahmed. See Ağaoğlu Ahmed Bey  
Ahmed Cemâl Paşa (1872-1922) 210, 225  
Ahmed Cevdet (1822-95) 12, 13, 14, 24, 26, 31, 37, 52, 59, 64, 66, 71, 72, 73, 93, 94, 95, 110, 127, 130, 135, 145, 149, 156, 157, 166, 169, 171, 210, 223, 253  
Ahmed Cevdet [Oran] 24  
Ahmed Hamid [Ongunsu] (1885-1967) 230  
Ahmed III (1673-1736, rule 1703-30) v, vii, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 43, 47, 49, 51, 54, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 89, 93, 95, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 116, 117, 126, 127, 128, 129, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 171, 174, 175, 202, 211, 212, 225, 240, 252, 253  
Ahmed Râsım (1864-1932) 26, 217  
Ahmed Tevhid (1868-1940) 68  
Ahmet Cevat [Emre] (1887-1961) 135, 142  
Akbank 1  
Akçura. See Yusuf Akçura[oğlu]  
Aksan, Virginia 2  
Aktepe, Münir M. (1917-96) 68, 71 223  
Alberoni, Cardinal (1664-1752) 211  
Alcohol 153, 174, 249, 250  
Ali Canib [Yöntem] (1887-1967) 93, 94, 95, 110, 112, 115, 116, 153, 161, 173  
Ali Muzaffer [Göker] (1890-1959) 143  
Ali Suavi (1839-78) 106, 107, 108, 109, 150, 173, 236  
Ali Üsküdarî (ca 1110-80/1699-1767) 18  
Alp, Sedat (1913-2006) 163, 254  
Alphabet 102, 103, 104, 111, 112, 124, 131, 132, 154, 160, 231, 242  
Amcazâde Hüseyin Paşa (1644-1702) 245

- Anatolia 87, 88, 99, 100, 111, 118, 120, 123, 124, 125, 142, 144, 163, 173, 241, 247  
 Ankara 88, 96, 97, 100, 119, 143, 231, 253  
 Arab 35, 36, 57, 118, 132, 204, 212, 218, 219, 239  
 Architectural 35, 36, 38, 39, 55, 62, 75, 76, 83, 90, 94, 95, 101, 129, 132, 133, 137, 139, 153  
 Architecture 2, 3, 5, 35, 36, 38, 40, 100, 132, 159  
 Arsal, Sadri Maksudi (1880-1957) 147  
 Arseven. See Celâl Esad [Arseven]  
 Artan, Tülay 2  
 Atâ. See Tayyazâde Ahmed Atâ  
 Atatürk. See Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk]  
 Atay. See Falih Rifki [Atay]  
 Avram Galanti [Bodrumlu] (1873-1961) 98, 120, 143, 241  
 - B -  
*Bâb-ı Hümâyûn* (Imperial Gate) 35, 36, 37, 75, 132, 239  
 Babinger, Franz (1891-1967) 12, 25, 98  
 Bach, Johann Sebastian (1685-1750) 2  
 Baha Tëvfik (1881-1914) 43  
 Balkan Wars (1912-13) 24, 74, 215, 216  
 Baltacıođlu. See İsmail Hakkı [Baltacıođlu]  
 Banarlı, Nihad Sâmi (1907-74) 9, 20  
 Barkan. See Ömer Lütfi  
 Baroque 5, 101  
 Baykal, Bekir Sıtkı (1908-87) 109, 163  
 Baysun, Cavit (1899-1968) 154  
 Bayur, Hikmet. See Yusuf Hikmet [Bayur]  
 Berkes, Niyazi (1908-88) 3, 27, 34, 154, 156, 175, 201, 211, 212, 234, 235, 236  
 Berktaş, Halil 204, 233  
 Beyatlı. See Yahya Kemal [Beyatlı]  
 Bigotry 44, 48, 81, 94, 146, 163, 164, 171  
 Bilsel, Cemil (1879-1949) 145, 146, 158, 159  
 Blanc, Charles (1813-82) 15  
 Bloch, Marc (1886-1944) 151, 250  
 Bodrumlu. See Avram Galanti [Bodrumlu]  
 Bonac. See Usson, Jean-Louis de  
 Boppe, Auguste (1862-1921) 26, 40, 76, 149, 171, 209, 214  
 Bowen, Harold 2  
 Burckhardt Jacob (1818-97) 79, 116, 139, 246  
 Butterfield, Herbert (1900-79) 172, 256  
 Büyük Ada 24, 144, 203, 247  
 - C -  
 Çađatay, Neşet 12  
 Çađatay, Neşet 12  
 Cahun, Léon (1841-1900) 233, 240  
 Caliphate. See *Hilâfet*  
 Çambel. See Hasan Cemil [Çambel]  
 Cantemir, Demetrius, Voivode of Moldavia, (1673-1723) 169  
 Carlyle, Thomas (1750-1881) 60  
 Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Viscount (1769-1822) 29  
 Catherine the Great (1729-96) 91  
 Celâl Esad [Arseven] (1876-1972) 16, 17, 18, 100, 101, 102, 112, 126, 137, 138, 149

- Çelebizâde Asım Efendi (d.1173/1760) 25, 55, 156, 208, 211, 242  
 Çelebizâde. See Çelebizâde Asım Efendi  
 Çeşme 35, 36, 37, 75, 132, 136, 239, 243  
 Cevdet. See Ahmed Cevdet  
 Charmes, Gabriel (1858-86) 210  
 Chénier, Louis de (1722-1796) 133  
 Childs, John 33, 250  
 CHP. See Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi  
 Christian 32, 56, 74, 105, 139, 154, 155, 156, 158, 218  
 Christianity 32, 87  
 Çığıracan. See İbrahim Hilmi [Çığıracan] (1876-1973)  
 Code civil. Originally called the Code civil des Français, also known as the Code Napoléon, which came into power on 21 March 1804. 2  
 Cold War 166  
 Committee of Union and Progress. See İttihad ve Terakkî Cemiyeti  
 Congress iv, 29, 98, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 135, 142, 145, 160, 161, 162, 163, 239, 240, 243, 244  
 Constantinople 18, 82, 89, 111  
 Constitutional period (1908-18) 89, 102, 212  
 Cumhuriyet 88, 97, 98  
 Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası. See Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi  
 Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi, originally Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası (Republican People's Party) 88, 253  
 Cythera, sanctuary of Aphrodite 15  
 - D -  
 Damad İbrahim Paşa (1670-1730) v, 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 17, 26, 30, 37, 47, 54, 61, 63, 66, 67, 70, 72, 73, 78, 82, 83, 85, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98, 103, 104, 107, 108, 110, 111, 123, 129, 131, 150, 156, 158, 161, 162, 166, 167, 169, 211, 212, 213, 217, 222, 223, 224, 233, 235, 237, 251, 252, 253  
 Damad. See Damad İbrahim Paşa  
 Danişmend, İsmail Hami (1899-1967) 165  
 Darülfünûn 97, 98, 142, 143, 145, 151, 203, 216, 246  
 Demiray, Tahsin (1903-71) 165, 254  
 Denny, Walter 18  
 Diehl, Charles (1859-1944) 60  
 Dilâverzâde Ömer Efendi 30, 32, 221  
 Divan 206  
 Duru, Kâzım (1876-1967) 124, 204, 242  
 - E -  
 Ebüzziya Tevfik (1848-1913) 109, 204  
 Edebiyat Fakültesi (Faculty of Letters) 142, 159  
 Edirne 75, 82, 83, 251  
 Eldem. See Halil Edhem [Eldem]  
 Emre. See Ahmet Cevat [Emre]  
 Encümen-i Daniş 12, 17, 166, 207  
 Encyclopaedia of Islam (EI) 2, 152  
 Enver Paşa (1881-1922) 75, 210, 225  
 Ertem, Sadri (1900-1943) 128  
 Esat [Sagay] (1873-1938) 119, 122, 240  
 Eti. See Hittite

- European 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 38, 48, 53, 55, 57, 61, 64, 65, 66, 73, 74, 76, 79, 80, 91, 96, 99, 100, 101, 109, 115, 116, 118, 122, 126, 129, 131, 132, 148, 149, 153, 157, 171, 172, 207, 212, 216, 225, 232, 234, 239, 255
- Evin, Ahmet 3, 4, 250
- Ezan (call to prayer) 102
- F -
- Faik Reşid Unat (1889-1964) 108, 109, 162
- Falih Rifkî [Atay] (1894-1971) 145
- Farhi, David 48
- Faroqhi, Suraiya 1, 4, 204
- Fatih. See Mehmed II (1451-81)
- Fatma Aliye (1862-1936) 66, 67, 72, 73, 224
- Fatma Sultan (1704-33). Daughter of Ahmed III and wife of Damad İbrahim. 63, 64, 65
- Feminism 42, 120
- Feminist 43
- Ferriol, Marquis de (1652-1718) 157
- Fêtes galantes 15, 19, 20
- Fetva 96
- Fındıklılı Şemdanizâde Süleyman Efendi (d. 1779) 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 94, 127, 145, 157, 166, 169, 223
- France 5, 10, 11, 24, 25, 26, 38, 39, 40, 61, 76, 101, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 127, 150, 151, 239, 243, 249
- francophilia 65
- Fuâd Paşa (1815-69) 74
- G -
- Galatasaray 136
- Gazel 15, 19
- Gerçek Davud Ağa 55
- Gerçek. See Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek]
- German 36, 69, 136, 141, 160
- Gezgin, Hakkı Süha (1895-1963) 245
- Gobineau, Arthur de (1816-82) 227
- Göcek, Müge 2, 4, 236
- Gökalp. See Mehmed Ziya Gökalp
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib (1907-1981) 252
- Göker. See Ali Muzaffer [Göker]
- Goncourt, Jules (1830-70) and Edmond (1822-96) de 15, 20, 206
- Goodwin, Godfrey (1921-2005) 75, 225
- Gövsâ. See İbrahim Alâettin [Gövsâ]
- Grand Vezir 10, 13, 17, 26, 29, 31, 32, 37, 41, 46, 47, 54, 55, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 79, 82, 83, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 126, 131, 139, 148, 155, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166, 167, 171, 172
- Grand Vezirate 1, 209
- Great War, the (1914-18) 28, 75, 76, 79, 87, 88, 160
- Greece 79
- Güçer. See Yusuf Behçet [Güçer]
- Guignard, François Emmanuel, Comte de Saint-Priest (1735-1821) 25
- Gülhâne Hatt-ı Hümayûnu (3 November 1839) 73, 151
- Günaltay. See Şemsettin [Günaltay]
- Gutenberg, Johannes (1400-68) 111, 238

## - H -

- Habsburgs 13, 69, 210, 214  
 Hafız Osman (1052-1110/1642-98) 252  
 Halevy, Joseph (1827-1917) 240  
 Halide Edib [Adivar] (1882-1964) 37, 87, 96, 129, 130, 131  
 Halil Edhem [Eldem] (1861-1938) 99  
 Halil Hamid Paşa (c.1707-1789) 148  
 Halit Fahri [Ozansoy] (1891-1971) 52, 134  
 Halkevi (People's House) 119  
 Halman, Talat 2  
 Hamdullah Suphî [Tanrıöver] (1885-1966) 119  
 Hamidian 24, 27, 57, 121, 130, 241  
 Hammer. See Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von  
 Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von (1774-1856) 17, 170, 207, 217, 218, 223, 235, 239  
 Hanotaux, Gabriel (1853-1944) 170, 256  
 Harmanlık 68  
 Hasan Cemil [Çambel] (1879-1967) 115, 116, 120, 139, 146, 242  
 Haydarpaşa 32  
 Hayden White Victor 172, 175, 202, 255  
 hedonism 13, 172  
 hedonist 12, 59, 83, 130  
 Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa (1689-1758) (sad âret 1732-35) 148  
 Helva 12, 60, 96  
 Hilâfet 88, 231  
 Hilaire, Jean-Baptiste (1753-c. 1822) 77  
 Hilav, Selahattin 3  
 Hisar. See Abdülhak Şinasi [Hisar]  
 Historiography 4, 96, 117, 123, 154, 165, 210, 232, 249  
 History Thesis. See Türk Tarih Tezi  
 Hittite 100, 118, 120, 125, 163, 232, 240  
 Holy Sepulchre, Church of the 60, 76  
 Hrozny, Franz (1879-1953) 100, 233  
 Hurgronje, C. Snouck (1857-1936) 98  
 Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha (1855-1922) (sad âret 1909-10) 10, 203

## - I -

- İbrahim Alâettin [Gövsal] (1889-1949) 134  
 İbrahim Hilmi [Çığıracan] (1876-1973) 217  
 İbrahim Hilmi [Çığıracan] 46, 59, 62, 102, 111, 131, 133, 134  
 İbrahim Müteferrika (1674-1747) 32, 33, 35, 54, 59, 91, 94, 110, 212, 237  
 Ignorance 45, 56, 81, 104, 146, 171, 230, 247  
 İkdâm, newspaper published between 1894 and 1928 9, 24, 26, 27, 36, 37, 43, 45, 52, 63,  
 66, 75, 79, 87, 88, 123, 208, 209, 212, 221, 230  
 Illumination (Çırağan) 47  
 İlmiyye 216  
 İlmiyye 45, 57  
 İmâle (pronunciation of short vowels as long) 16, 19, 206  
 İnkılâb 96, 143, 153  
 İnkılâb, Kemalist reform movement 96, 143, 153  
 Innovation 81, 172  
 İnönü. See İsmet [İnönü]

İpşir[oğ]lu]. See Mazhar Şevket

Iran 15, 17, 18, 19, 30, 34, 44, 49, 69, 92, 101, 217

İrdelp, Neşet Ömer (1882-1948) 158

İrdelp, Neşet Ömer 158

İsfahan 38, 39, 90, 133

İslâm Ansiklopedisi (İA) 152, 153

İslâm Ansiklopedisi 152, 153

İslam v, 2, 16, 27, 28, 32, 34, 50, 66, 67, 73, 80, 87, 97, 99, 102, 117, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124, 129, 133, 136, 139, 141, 142, 144, 146, 147, 152, 153, 155, 164, 165, 171, 174, 205, 209, 212, 234, 246, 248, 253

Islamic 5, 27, 32, 44, 57, 74, 78, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 117, 118, 119, 121, 129, 132, 134, 135, 141, 146, 147, 152, 155, 156, 160, 164, 165, 174, 209, 219, 239, 242

Islamism 3, 77, 209

Islamist 27, 57, 74, 209, 253

İsmail Hakkı [Baltacıoğlu] (1886-1978) 143, 148, 174

İsmet [İnönü] (1884-1973) 96, 141, 146, 160, 174

İspirizâde Efendi 47, 50, 217

İstanbul 3, 5, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 57, 61, 64, 68, 69, 70, 76, 77, 79, 88, 89, 90, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 127, 130, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, 160, 167, 170, 171, 175, 209, 213, 220, 222, 235, 236, 245, 247, 253

İstanbul Üniversitesi 142, 143

İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti, secret society founded 1889 in opposition to the rule of Abdülhamid II. 24, 209, 228, 231

İzafet, a grammatical compound connecting nouns and qualifiers 161, 165

- J -

Janissaries 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 48, 70, 92, 172, 211, 226

Jazz 2

Jerusalem 76

Johann Rudolf Schmid, Freiherr zum Schwarzenhorn (1590-1667) 41

- K -

Kabakçı Mustafa 62, 146, 220

Kadı 42, 49, 52, 57, 70

Kadızaade 80

Kafadar, Cemal 1, 5

Kâğıthane. See Kâğıthane

Kâğıthane 11, 14, 52, 64, 65, 67, 69, 81, 83, 94, 133

Kahraman, Âlim 9, 203

Kaplan, Mehmed (1915-1986) 244

Kara Mustafa Paşa, Merzifonlu (c. 1635-83, sadâret 1676-83) 29

Karacsón, Imre (1863-1911) 54, 110, 169, 236

Karakol Cemiyeti 87

Karal, Enver Ziya (1906-1982) 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 162, 163, 164, 167, 174, 175, 211, 235, 249, 250, 251

Karlowitz, Treaty of (26 January 1699) 29, 53, 54, 123, 148, 221

Kasır 14, 39, 64, 101

Kâtib Çelebi (1609-57) 68, 111, 169

Kâzım Karabekir 141

Kemalism 87, 146

- Kemalist v, 5, 85, 87, 88, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 117, 118, 119, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 139, 141, 142, 145, 147, 151, 154, 157, 159, 161, 165, 166, 167, 174, 175, 228, 230, 234, 238, 239, 252, 253
- Kenter, Yıldız 2
- Kıbrıslı. See Mehmed Kâmil Paşa
- Kızılbaş 69
- Koca Ragıp Paşa (1699-1763) (sad âret 1757-63) 148, 149
- Köprülü, Mehmet Fuat. See Köprülüzâde, Mehmed Fuad
- Köprülüzâde, Mehmed Fuad (1890-1966) 233
- Koran 102
- Korgunal, Muharrem Zeki 164
- Köşk 134
- Kozanoğlu. See Abdullah Ziya [Kozanoğlu]
- Küçük Kaynarca, Treaty of (21 July 1774) 12, 147
- Kurat, Akdes Nimet (1903-1971) 157, 252
- L -
- Lâle Devri v, 2, 9, 15, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 72, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 90, 101, 110, 111, 112, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 139, 147, 148, 161, 162, 164, 167, 171, 172, 174
- Lane-Poole, Stanley (1854-1931) 99
- Lausanne, Treaty of (24 July 1923) 88
- Lavisse, Ernest (1842-1922) 9, 11, 20, 25, 203
- Lâyihâ (memorandum) 250, 251
- Lâyihâ 154, 155, 156
- Lenoir, Monsieur 38, 39, 62, 137
- Lewis, Bernard 3, 33, 156, 173, 175, 211, 228, 234, 235, 236, 243, 251
- London, Treaty of (10 June 1913) 74, 108, 129
- Louis XV (1710-74) 76
- Louis XVI (1754-93) 61
- M -
- Maarif Vekâleti (Ministry of Education) 89, 110, 119, 158, 174, 225, 229, 243
- Mahbûb, tulip species 14, 42, 72
- Mahmud I (1696-1754, r. 1730-54) 25, 33, 34, 35, 39, 52, 71, 81, 138, 160, 208, 210, 220, 229
- Malche, Albert (1876-1956) 142, 247
- Mallarmé, Stéphane (1842-98) 20
- Malta 106
- Mamboury, Ernest (1878-1953) 136, 138
- Mansurizâde Mustafa Nuri Paşa (1824-90) 12, 14, 26, 37, 42, 49, 50, 64, 71, 72, 73, 82, 83, 90, 92, 169, 217
- Marie-Antoinette (1755-93) 61
- Marshall Aid, United States' European Recovery Program (ERP), 1947-51 166
- Mazhar Şevket [İpşir[oğlu] (1908-1985) 116, 246
- Mazioğlu, Hasibe 16
- Medrese 12, 45, 56, 57, 79, 80, 81, 93, 94, 95, 133, 171, 172, 175, 215, 216, 226, 230
- Mehmed Âkif 28
- Mehmed Hulusi Efendi, the Şam Ruznamceçisi 162, 208
- Mehmed II (1432-81, r. 1451-81) 216
- Mehmed III (1566-1603), r. 1595-1603 28, 80
- Mehmed IV (1641-92), r. 1648-87 41, 60, 80, 82, 83, 101, 161
- Mehmed Kâmil Paşa (1832-1913), Kıbrıslı (sadâret 1885-91, 1895, 1908-09, 1912-13) 55
- Mehmed Namık Kemal (1840-88) 217, 241



- Mehmed Said Efendi, son of Yirmisekiz Çelebi (d. 1761) 54, 66, 91, 94, 111, 220, 234  
 Mehmed Sami [Yetik] (1878-1945) 10  
 Mehmed Subhî Efendi (d. 1182/1769) 71, 209, 224  
 Mehmed Talat (1874-1921) 87, 210  
 Mehmed V [Reşad] (1844-1918) 10, 49  
 Mehmed Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) 75, 77, 78, 79, 89, 92, 98, 139, 146, 147, 225, 226  
 Melikoff, Irène 2  
 Menderes, Adnan (1899-1961). Turkish Prime Minister, 1950-61. He was executed by the military junta that overthrew his Demokrat Parti government on 27 May 1960. 247  
 Meşrutiyet (Constitution) 74, 121, 122  
 Meyer, Eduard (1855-1930) 241  
 Michelet, Jules (1798-1874) 11, 203, 205  
 Mignot, Vincent (c. 1730-90) 26, 51, 208, 217  
 Milli Şef ('National Leader'). See İsmet [İnönü]  
 Mimar Sinan (1490-1588) 100  
 Minorsky, Vladimir (1877-1969) 98  
 Modernism 115, 139, 225  
 Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley (1690-1762) 26, 55, 131, 209  
 Mudros, Armistice of (30 October 1918) 79  
 Murad II (1402-51) 82  
 Murad III (1546-95, r. 1574-95) 80, 226  
 Musahipzâde Celal (1870-1959) 134  
 Muslim 5, 28, 46, 50, 69, 74, 75, 124, 144, 164, 203, 205, 207, 211, 217, 219, 233, 238, 246, 249  
 Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk] (1881-1938) 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 96, 103, 112, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 124, 129, 135, 141, 143, 144, 166, 173, 229, 241, 254  
 Mustafa Reşid Paşa (1800-58) 12, 34, 203, 212, 224  
 Mütefferika. See İbrahim Mütefferika  
 - N -  
 Nabi (1642-1712) 161  
 Nadir Shah (1688-1747) 69  
 Namık Kemal. See Mehmed Namık Kemal  
 Napoléon Bonaparte (1769-1821) 2, 213  
 Napoléon. See Napoléon Bonaparte  
 Nasihatnâme 32  
 Necib Asım [Yazıksız] (1861-1935) 99, 233  
 Nedim (1679-1730) 9, 11, 15, 16, 52, 82, 133, 134, 135, 139, 161, 163  
 Neumann, Christoph 4, 31, 166, 207, 210  
 Nevşehirli. See Damad İbrahim Paşa  
 Nietzsche, Friedrich (1844-1900) 79, 115, 139, 159, 227  
 Nizam-ı Cedid 3, 30, 31, 35, 59, 91, 153, 162  
 Nuri. See Mansurizâde Mustafa Nuri Paşa  
 - O -  
 Occident 5, 36, 39, 66, 137, 149, 205  
 Ömer Lütfi [Barkan] (1905-79) 151, 152, 250  
 Omont, Henri (1857-1940) 226  
 Ongunsu. See Ahmed Hamid [Ongunsu]  
 Orient 5, 36, 39, 40, 55, 149, 170, 205, 255  
 Orientalist 17, 25, 232, 234, 239  
 Ortaç. See Yusuf Ziya [Ortaç]

- Osman Gazi (c.1281-1324) 11  
 Osman Şevki [Uludağ] (1889-1964) 158, 251  
 Osmanzâde Ahmed Tâib (1660-1724) 30  
 Ottoman Empire 3, 4, 12, 15, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 46, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 66, 74, 76, 77, 79, 87, 88, 89, 92, 96, 98, 108, 112, 116, 119, 121, 123, 125, 135, 136, 137, 143, 147, 148, 154, 157, 159, 162, 163, 165, 169, 171, 172, 173, 211, 217, 219, 237  
 Ottoman iv, v, vi, vii, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 203, 204, 206, 207, 211, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 221, 222, 224, 226, 232, 234, 235, 239, 240, 241, 242, 245, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253  
 Ottomanism 10, 74, 78, 204, 209  
 Ottomanist 1, 10, 56, 73, 74, 78, 139, 163, 170, 209  
 31 Mart Vakası (Counter-insurrection of 13 April 1909)  
 Oxford 98  
 Ozansoy. See Halit Fahri [Ozansoy]  
 - P -  
 Paris 9, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 36, 38, 54, 60, 61, 62, 76, 94, 101, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 137,  
 Passarowitz, Treaty of (21 July 1718) 2, 13, 29, 53, 54, 59, 64, 75, 90, 104, 106, 107, 123, 126, 134, 148, 161, 210, 220, 236, 251  
 Pater, Walter (1839-94) 227  
 Patrona Halil (d. 26 November 1730) 20, 25, 28, 48, 50, 57, 62, 63, 65, 71, 92, 94, 110, 111, 128, 133, 146, 160, 161, 162, 171, 172, 208  
 Patrona Halil Rebellion (4 Rebiyülevvel 1143/18 September 1730) 57, 62, 63, 111, 128, 171, 172  
 Paul Verlaine (1844-96) 15  
 Perşembe Dergisi 10, 36, 60, 170  
 Persian 16, 17, 18, 19, 38, 103, 126, 165, 204, 207, 233, 234  
 Persianate 16, 18, 20, 100, 102, 104, 126  
 Peter the Great (1672-1725) 26, 55, 59  
 Petrovaradin 63  
 Pirenne, Henri (1862-1935) 205  
 President 10, 117, 120, 129, 144, 146, 158, 160  
 Print 54, 104, 110  
 Printing press 32, 54, 55, 61, 91, 94, 103, 104, 107, 109, 110, 111, 139, 150, 170, 173, 221, 234  
 Propaganda 31, 74, 88, 100, 136, 143, 144, 219  
 Pruth, battle on the (18-21 July 1711) 59  
 - R -  
 Râşid Mehmed Efendi (1148/1735) 25, 70, 93, 156, 173, 208, 213, 218, 225, 236  
 Râşid. See Râşid Mehmed Efendi  
 Refik Ahmed [Sevengil] (1903-70) 95, 96, 104, 173  
 régence, rule of the Philippe d'Orléans (1674-1723) during the minority of Louis XV (1715-23) 76, 109, 110  
 Renaissance 5, 23, 45, 54, 56, 75, 76, 77, 79, 91, 95, 101, 104, 109, 110, 111, 115, 116, 137, 138, 139, 149, 150, 153, 159, 172, 173, 225, 245  
 Renan, Ernest (1823-92) 240  
 Reşid. See Mustafa Reşid Paşa  
 Reşit Galip (1897-1934) 120, 242  
 rococo 137, 138  
 Roman Empire 62

- Rome 79
- Rouvroy, Louis de, the duc de Saint-Simon (1665-1755) 222, 243
- Rûm 16
- Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın] (1892-1959) 82, 95, 173
- Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın] (1892-1959) 82, 95, 173, 240
- Rüstem Paşa (sadâret, 1551-61) 89
- S -
- Saadabad 4, 9, 11, 14, 16, 19, 20, 37, 39, 40, 42, 52, 61, 62, 64, 65, 75, 77, 81, 82, 83, 94, 95,  
101, 126, 132, 134
- Sadâret 1, 13, 19, 49, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 89, 90, 93, 102, 107, 110, 149, 154, 175, 222, 234, 250
- Sadr-ı Âzam 71, 234, 244
- Safavid Empire, 1501-1722 18, 19, 211
- Sagay. See Esat [Sagay]
- Sahhaflar Şeyhi-zâde Mehmed Esad Efendi (c.1786-1848) 154, 155, 156
- Saint-Priest. See Guignard, François Emmanuel
- Salaberry, Charles Marie, Comte de (1766-1847) 51
- Salzman, Ariel 4
- Samih Rifat (1874-1932) 120, 242
- Saraçoğlu, Şükrü (1887-1953) 160, 164, 248
- Sarı Mehmed Paşa (d. 1129/1717) 212
- Sauveur, Louis, Marquis de Villeneuve (1675-1747) 26, 39
- Savoy. See Eugene of Savoy
- Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani (1838-86) 220
- Saz style 18, 19
- Schefer, Charles (1820-98) 25, 31, 171, 208, 210
- School 31, 35, 59, 60, 89, 92, 99, 111, 112, 121, 122, 125, 126, 127, 136, 142, 143, 170
- Schwarzenhorn. See Johann Rudolf Schmid
- Secular 2, 3, 146, 147
- Secularism 3, 34, 116, 139, 141, 153, 233
- Sefâretnâme 25, 31, 101, 108, 109, 129, 210, 235
- Şehbal 23, 43, 218, 220
- Seignobos, Charles (1854-1942) 10, 20, 36, 122, 132, 213, 240
- Selim III (1761-1808, r. 1789-1807) 3, 24, 31, 35, 60, 62, 63, 81, 108, 131, 153, 154, 166, 167,  
210
- Selim Nüzhet [Gerçek] (1891-1945) 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 129, 130, 137,  
138, 149, 150, 158, 173, 235, 236, 237, 243, 253
- Şemdanizâde. See Fındıklılı Şemdanizâde Süleyman Efendi
- Şemsettin [Günaltay] (1883-1961) 124, 135, 160, 216
- Sevengil. See Refik Ahmed [Sevengil]
- Sèvres, Treaty of (10 August 1920) 88
- Şeyhülislâm 45, 50, 70, 71, 216
- Shaw, Stanford J. (1930-2006) 27, 106
- Sheikh Said, Nakşibendî (d. 28 June 1925) 96, 230
- Silahdar Ali Paşa, Grand Vezir (1713-16) 63
- Silay, Kemal 2, 236, 250
- Sobieski, King Jan (1629-96) 29
- Somel, Akşin 4, 202
- Soviet Union 165
- Strohmeier, Martin 4
- Sultan-Husayn, Safavid Shah (r. 1694-1725, d. 1729) 18

- Sungu, İhsan 154  
 - T -
- Takrir 106, 109  
 Takrir-i Sükkün Kanunu, Law of the Maintenance of Order (4 March 1925) 96, 231  
 Talimât 105, 173  
 Tanin 213  
 Tanpınar, Ahmed Hamdi (1901-1962) 14, 15, 16, 20, 145, 159, 160, 164, 201, 205, 206, 208, 248, 253  
 Tanrıöver. See Hamdullah Suphî [Tanrıöver]  
 Tanzimat, Ottoman reform movement (1839-76) v, 12, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 79, 89, 92, 95, 106, 121, 126, 129, 132, 133, 139, 141, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 166, 167, 172, 174, 205,, 206, 211, 223, 224, 234, 241, 250  
 Tarih-i Kadim (1905) 27  
 Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni (TOE or Ottoman Historical Society) 9, 10, 11, 23, 54, 66, 73, 96, 97, 98, 99, 116, 135, 143, 148, 161, 169, 170, 204  
 Tarikat-ı Salâhiye Cemiyeti 97  
 Taylor-Horrex, Susan 15  
 Tayyazâde Ahmed Atâ 208, 211, 212, 213, 221  
 TBMM, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi or Turkish Parliament 88, 141, 142, 228  
 Tehlirian, Soghomon (1897-1960) 160  
 Tekiner, M. Efdalrettin (1873-1957) 160  
 Tevfik Fikret 27, 28, 57  
 Tevhid-i Tedrisat Kanunu, Law on the Unification of Education (3 March 1924) 93, 94  
 Third Holy League 123  
 Tıp Bayramı (Medical Festival on 14 March) 158  
 TOE See Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni  
 Topkapı 25, 64, 94, 137, 222, 233  
 Transylvania 31  
 Triple Entente (The alliance formed in 1907 among Great Britain and Ireland, the French Third Republic and the Russian Empire) 76  
 Tripoli 24  
 TTE. See Türk Tarih Encümeni  
 TTK. See Türk Tarih Kurumu  
 TTTC. See Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti  
 Tulip Age iii, v, vii, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 28, 41, 42, 43, 44, 48, 50, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 110, 111, 112, 115, 121, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 166, 169, 172, 173, 174, 175, 248, 250, 251, 252  
 Tulip Entertainments 11, 14, 83  
 Tulip iii, v, vii, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 28, 31, 35, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 50, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 110, 111, 112, 115, 121, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 166, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 214, 222, 223  
 Tulipomania 40, 41  
 Tunaya, Tarık Zafer (1915-91) 2, 3  
 Tuñçay, Mete 100, 118  
 Türk Tarih Kongresi 119, 120, 121, 123, 125, 135, 142, 144  
 Türk Tarih Kurumu (TTK) 135, 141, 142, 146, 149, 153, 160, 161, 162, 165, 166, 167, 173,

- 174, 175, 248  
 Türk Tarih Tezi 118, 165  
 Türk Tarih Tezi, (Turkish History Thesis) 232, 238, 252  
 Türk Tarihi Encümeni (TTE), Turkish History Society 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 111, 116, 117, 121, 125, 143, 144, 145  
 Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti (TTTC) 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 149, 244  
 Türk Tarihi Tetkik Heyeti 118  
 Turkey iii, 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 18, 27, 29, 30, 34, 43, 48, 50, 53, 55, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 109, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 124, 125, 129, 130, 131, 135, 138, 139, 141, 143, 145, 146, 152, 153, 158, 160, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 204, 229, 230, 232, 234, 235, 243, 248, 249, 253  
 Turkey's Grand National Assembly. See TBMM  
 Turkish History Congress. See Türk Tarih Kongresi  
 Turkish History Thesis. See Türk Tarih Tezi  
 Turkish v, vi, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 24, 39, 45, 73, 74, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 87, 88, 89, 91, 94, 96, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 152, 153, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 165, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 204, 206, 207, 208, 213, 228, 231, 232, 234, 238, 239, 240, 242, 247, 253  
 Turkist 75, 77, 78, 98, 99, 138, 209  
 - U -  
 Ulema 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 56, 57, 64, 69, 70, 71, 79, 80, 81, 82, 92, 133, 147, 163, 172, 215, 221, 226, 248  
 Uludağ, Osman Şevki. See Osman Şevki [Uludağ]  
 Unat, Faik Reşid (1889-1964) 208, 235, 236, 250  
 Ünaydın. See Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın]  
 Unionist. See İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti  
 Uraz, Murat (1892-1981) 134  
 Üsküblü. See Mustafa Hayri Efendi  
 Üsküdar 34, 35, 50, 211, 224  
 Usson, Jean-Louis de, Marquis de Bonac (1672-1738) 25, 30, 31, 39, 40, 60, 101, 209  
 Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı (1888-1977) 143, 148, 149, 174, 248  
 - V -  
 Vakanüvis, official court chronicler 10, 12, 25, 34, 68, 70, 71, 94, 105, 129, 155, 156, 166  
 Vandal, Albert (1853-1912) 20, 26, 38, 39, 40, 90, 157, 171, 203, 208, 210, 215, 256  
 Vanmour, Jean-Baptiste (1671-1737) 77, 130  
 Varlık Vergisi (Wealth Tax) 164  
 Vasari, Giorgio (1511-74) 79  
 Versailles 38, 39, 61, 64, 65, 90, 101, 127, 133, 137  
 Vienna 28, 29, 36, 53, 108, 123, 126, 131  
 Villeneuve. See Sauveur  
 - W -  
 Waliszewski, Kazimierz (1849-1935) 26, 209  
 Watteau, Antoine (1684-1721) 15  
 Wensinck, Arent Jan (1882-1939) 250  
 West i, iii, vi, 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 116, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 136, 138, 142, 144, 146, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 174, 176, 178,

- 180, 182, 184, 186, 222, 210, 211, 225, 234, 240, 244, 250  
 Western 3, 4, 5, 23, 27, 39, 54, 61, 62, 64, 65, 80, 81, 94, 101, 106, 120, 121, 126, 127, 132, 136,  
 137, 148, 150, 151, 152, 165, 175, 213, 234, 235, 240, 250  
 Westernisation 1, 3, 5, 23, 24, 31, 108, 115, 148, 150, 151, 152, 153, 159, 162, 163, 166, 175, 202,  
 248  
 Westernism 3, 57, 225  
 Wittek, Paul (1894-1978) 53, 219  
 World War I. See the Great War  
 - Y -  
 Yahya Kemal [Beyatlı] (1884-1958) 1, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 54, 83, 95,  
 104, 126, 134, 159, 205, 206, 234  
 Yaşmak 67  
 Yazıksız. See Necib Asım [Yazıksız]  
 Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi (d. 1155/1742) 70, 71  
 Yetik. See Mehmed Sami [Yetik]  
 Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi (d. 1732) 76, 106, 150, 173, 226, 236  
 Yöntem. See Ali Canib [Yöntem]  
 Young Ottomans 106  
 Young Turk 74, 89, 118, 124, 173  
 Yücel, Hasan Âli (1897-1961) 53, 134, 139, 145, 146, 152, 154, 160, 167, 172, 174, 244, 248,  
 249, 253  
 Yusuf Akçura[oğlu] (1876-1935) 121, 122, 124, 144, 145, 210, 242  
 Yusuf Behçet [Güçer] (1890-1952) 143  
 Yusuf Hikmet [Bayur] (1891-1980) 123  
 Yusuf Ziya [Ortaç] (1895-1967) 120  
 - Z -  
 Zaviye (small dervish lodge) 93  
 Zer-i Mahbûb 72  
 zevk ü sefâ 26, 27, 63, 67, 74, 166, 169  
 Ziya Paşa 106  
 Zülâli Hasan Efendi 42, 47, 49, 50, 57, 70, 81, 92, 217  
 Zürcher, Erik J. 42, 47, 49, 50, 57, 81, 87, 88, 92, 103, 117, 253